

Drama in School - Events of Learning and Processes of Becoming

An example from Sweden

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the
University of Chester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by
Susanne Rosén

October 2019

*Title of thesis: Drama in School – Events of Learning and Processes of Becoming:
An example from Sweden*
Author: Susanne Rosén

Abstract

This thesis deals with issues relating to how learning takes place within drama education. The overall aim of the research study described in this thesis is to contribute to knowledge regarding what drama can be and how learning takes place in drama education when it constitutes a recurring part of compulsory schooling in Sweden. A sub-aim is to examine the components that co-produce such learning. A research study was conducted in Sweden where drama is not a compulsory subject in the national curriculum. Throughout the thesis, the focus is placed on the discursive formations and the components of dramatic form, content and processes of becoming. Explicit emphasis is placed on how these both articulate and iterate in drama educational practices. A combination of post-constructionism and drama theory is employed as key conceptual tools to capture and interpret pedagogical processes. Post-constructionism as a tool can be described as moves into and beyond stances of social constructionism and post-humanism. Within the broader frame of social constructionism, Dewey's educational philosophy has provided a means to understand the role of social interaction and communication in education. Within the post-humanistic field, a nomad philosophical approach provides the theoretical means with which to explore interrelations of discourses, materialities, social interaction and aesthetic symbols and further analyze doings in spaces in-between.

A key point of departure is that educational practices on macro- and micro-levels are interrelated. Therefore, a genealogical analysis of discursive formations of drama education as a part of the compulsory school system in Sweden, and an empirical study of local drama educational practices have been undertaken. All schools that participated in the study offer drama as a scheduled subject at some point over time. Four classes in three schools have been followed during drama lessons, and participating pupils have been interviewed. Both individual and group interviews were undertaken, and in the group interviews, drama is integrated as one method to construct data.

The study concludes by claiming that drama education can be understood as events where what we perceive and know (the actual) and what potentially may be (the virtual) are working on the same immanent plane. In drama educational practice, the components of dramatic art form, content and processes of subjectivities are interconnected. Learning and becoming take place as processes in-between, in the conceptual AND. The deployment of the analytic conjunction AND implies a non-dichotomous approach to drama education. In drama, the common, embodied creation and exploration of potential ways to act and become lead to engagement and to learning. This together with a focus on the common doing in the work of dramatization contributes to the meaning and simultaneous creation of 'drama' and 'group'. An important corollary is that who we can be, and hence our creation of meaning within the world, takes place as a synchronous process. Thereby, drama education mobilizes a pedagogy of learning and becoming that both challenges and complements the otherwise realized school education. Because drama opens up diverse ways of knowing in one and same educational event, it can contribute to equity in education.

Keywords: drama education, dramatic acting, improvisation, interconnection, learning process, post-constructionism, processes of becoming.

Declaration

The material being presented for examination is my own work and has not been submitted for an award of this or another HEI except in minor particulars which are explicitly noted in the body of the thesis. Where research pertaining to the thesis was undertaken collaboratively, the nature and extent of my individual contribution has been made explicit.

Signature:



Name:

Susanne Rosén

Date:

17 October 2019

Contents

Acknowledgements	1
PART I: Introduction and Contextualizing of the Research Questions	2
1. Introduction	3
1.1 Overall presentation of the research questions	6
1.1.1 A dichotomous practice.....	6
1.1.2 Learning – a complex activity	7
1.1.3 Summary	9
1.2 Background.....	10
1.2.1 Drama in the current Swedish curriculum for compulsory school.....	11
1.2.2 My personal entrance	16
1.2.3 Previous research about learning in drama.....	18
1.3 Aim and research questions	26
1.4 Definition of drama	28
1.4.1 A multifaceted field.....	28
1.4.2 Central drama concepts	30
1.5 Disposition of the thesis	35
2. Drama in the compulsory school system in Sweden.....	37
2. 1 Genealogy as a tool for analysis	38
2. 2 Drama as practice in relation to fosterage and knowledge	42
2.2.1 School theatre, play, and the birth of childhood	42
2.2.2 Children’s theatre, arts as fosterage and reform pedagogy	46
2.2.3 Democratic fosterage and a united school system.....	51
2.2.4 Developmental psychology and drama as method	53
2.2.5 Interactive theatre and a societal perspective	57
2.2.6 Efficiency, free choice and focus on knowledge.....	59
2.2.7 Decentralization of the school.....	65
2.3 Drama in Swedish school today	68
2.4 Conclusions of the genealogical analysis	72
PART II: Methodological Approach	76
3. Post-constructionism	78
3.1 Social constructionism.....	79
3.1.1 Dewey’s educational philosophy.....	80

3.2 In-between space	83
3.3 A nomadic approach.....	84
3.3.1 Segmentarity and micro-politics	86
3.3.2 Assemblages	88
3.3.3 Creation of concepts.....	91
3.4 Learning as act.....	92
3.4.1 Learning as inquiry and a collective process	96
3.4.2 Space for learning	99
4. Mapping as method.....	105
4.1 Multiple sites	106
4.1.1 Participating schools in the empirical study.....	108
4.1.2 Compilation of data material in the empirical study	113
4.2 Construction and analysis of data.....	114
4.2.1 Observations	115
4.2.2 Interviews.....	117
4.2.3 Drama as method to construct data	121
4.2.4 Cartography.....	124
4.2.5 Multimodal analysis	127
4.3 Research ethics	129
4.3.1 Research with children.....	132
4.4 Reflections about method	134
PART III: Analysis of Data Produced in the Empirical Study	136
5. Space-time for drama	137
5.1 Drama in the schedule – possibilities and tensions	137
5.1.1 Locally formulated purposes with drama education	137
5.1.2 Organization and structure of drama as a scheduled subject	140
5.1.2 Pupils’ voices about drama	144
5.1.3 Differences between locally formulated intentions and pupils’ perceived learning	157
5.1.4 “We get no grades in drama”	159
5.2 The physical space.....	164
5.2.1 Rooms for drama.....	165
5.2.2 Activity spaces	166
5.3 Summarizing reflections.....	172
6. “As if”	174

6.1 Dramatic acting “as if”	174
6.1.1 Working frames	175
6.1.2 Engagement	177
6.1.3 Strategies for collective creation	178
6.1.4 Ensemble-building.....	183
6.1.5 The actor and the role	190
6.1.6 Taking other(s) point of view	197
6.1.7 The participant as spectator	201
6.2 Forum play.....	205
6.2.1 Significance of aesthetic distancing	207
6.2.1 Corporeal and verbal reflection together	209
6.3 Summarizing reflections.....	213
7. Improvisation within drama education.....	214
7.1 Openness for the unpredictable	214
7.1.1 The example improvisation game Hitchhiker	217
7.1.2 To listen with various senses	224
7.2 Summarizing reflections.....	226
8. Summary of the discussion	228
8.1 Drama as events of knowing and potential becoming	228
8.1.1 Immanence of drama education.....	230
8.1.2 Interconnections of art form, content and processes of becoming.	233
8.1.3 The actor AND the role	237
8.1.4 Connections of politics on micro-and macro-level.....	240
8.2 Implications for drama education in Sweden	246
8.3 Discussion about methodological approach and methods to produce data	248
8.4 Proposal for future research.....	251
References	253
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Interview guide - pupils	268
Appendix 2: Interview guide – drama teachers	269

List of tables

Table 1: Compilation of research interventions	113
--	-----

Acknowledgements

Now I have written the last point in this thesis, after a long, explorative and exciting journey. Even though my postgraduate studies have been part-time, the issues about drama, learning and education have occupied me full-time by working in parallel as a teacher at Dalarna University. These activities have mutually enriched each other. To be studying at a British university but to undertake an empirical study within the Swedish compulsory school system has contributed to different perspectives and the possibility to question my assumptions. This is because it made it necessary to explain phenomena so that they become understandable to readers in different contexts. To write in English, which is not my first language, has contributed to the signification of the words being carefully considered in the translating process, and to deepened reflections concerning what I actually want to express. Thus, the journey has implied moves between activities, countries and languages, and this has contributed to my learning.

Research is a relational doing, and this thesis has been made possible by the contribution of many people. First of all, I especially want to thank every one of the youths who have participated in the study. You have shared perceptions and allowed me to follow your actions during drama education. I also want to acknowledge the drama teachers who gave me the possibility to follow drama lessons. You have made this study possible.

Many thanks to my two supervisors for your professional input during my PhD studies. Allan Owens, your support and constructive inputs concerning drama have continuously helped me onwards. Dean Garratt, your insightful comments concerning methodology have, among other things, been a prerequisite for my exploration of in-between spaces.

A special thanks to Eva Österlind. Your struggle for drama in university education in Sweden has, among other things, contributed to the possibility for me, and my Swedish PhD colleagues Sofia, Kerstin and Anneli, to undertake research studies at the University of Chester.

Many thanks also to all drama researchers and PhD colleagues in Sweden. The discussions with you and constructive feedback on texts in progress have been an important part of the research process.

Thanks Helen Nicholson, Bjørn Rasmussen and Ulrika von Schantz. You were readers of texts in progress and your comments have helped me a lot.

I want to acknowledge my colleagues at Dalarna University. Monika Vinterek, the former research leader for 'Education and Learning', and Sara Irisdotter Aldemyr, the current one, you have both given support during the process. Maria Olson, you were the reader of a text draft I presented for my colleagues in Dalarna, and gave constructive comments. I also want to thank each one of you within the teacher education, no one named and thereby nobody forgotten. I am so glad to have you as colleagues.

A special thanks to my family. You have supported me and been there for me, even though I have often been absent. My son Sebastian, I am seeing forward to continued, challenging discussions about philosophy, politics and other interesting issues. And Ludwig, my grandson, now it is time to play!

Susanne Rosén
Falun, October 2019

PART I

Introduction and Contextualizing of the Research Questions

This thesis is about drama education in compulsory school. Focus lies on what drama can be within the compulsory school system in Sweden and on how learning take place in and through drama.

At the same time as I started the present research project (2011), major reforms were implemented within Swedish school education, for example a new Education Act and new curriculum for compulsory school. These reforms were based on a traditional view of knowledge with an emphasis on subject-specific knowledge, and a neo-liberal logic, which, among other things, implies an individualized education where the educational process is subordinated to the outcomes. It led, among other things, to an increased emphasis on individual performance and measurable knowledge. At a national level, drama previously did not have a strong position within school education as a knowledge field and way of knowing, and these reforms contributed to make it even more marginalized. However, there are some compulsory schools in Sweden where drama education is offered regularly at some point over time.

On basis of this, the research study described in the present thesis has a focus on what characterizes drama education when realized within the current compulsory school education governed by an emphasis on subject-specific knowledge and a neo-liberal ideology. The actual situation for drama in school is discussed through a genealogical analysis of which discourses over time concerning education and drama have contributed to how it is today in Sweden. In order to investigate what drama can be within this context, and how drama and learning in and through drama are perceived by the participating pupils, I undertook an empirical study. The empirical study provides an example of how drama can be practiced within a national educational context.

In the first part, I present the research question and the background for them.

1. Introduction

The overall question for the present research study is what drama can be and how learning takes place in drama education, when drama constitutes a recurring part of compulsory schooling. The study is undertaken in Sweden where drama is not offered as a compulsory subject in the national curriculum. This is the case in the most countries in the world¹, even though the conditions for whether and how drama is used within education varies between countries. As the drama researcher, Gavin Bolton (2007) points out, the different conditions for and ways to use drama have contributed to a mosaic of drama activities in educational practice.

What drama can be within formal education is affected by various factors, such as for example national policy, school policy, and the current approach to drama among drama practitioners. Regarding school policy, it is today dominated by the forces of a much broader and more pervasive neo-liberal ideology. This concerns compulsory schools in Sweden, and seems also to concern other countries (Ball, 2016). Some guiding principles within neo-liberalism are the free market, competition and individual choice, and management based on efficiency and the achievement of results. In school education, this leads, among other things, to increased individualization and a scrutiny of the learner and so a focus on what is learned and on achieved results (Ball, 2010; Biesta, 2011; Carlgren, 2014; Wahlström, 2014). Learning thus becomes a matter of achieving according to predesignated learning outcomes. Where outcomes should be the very things that lead out of learning, they rather become the substance of education. This might simultaneously imply a notion of learning that the pupil as an individual will strive to achieve expected and measurable goals. Thus, education becomes a thing to be “supplied by the teacher [... and...]”² consumed by the learner”, as Biesta (2006, p. 28) describes it. Such a definition of learning implies a unilateral focus on individuals as autonomous and simultaneously adaptable to what is required for the labor market, based on individual achievements of predetermined skills and competences. The one who

¹ Today drama is compulsory in Australia and Iceland.

² In quotations, the symbol [] is used to mark changes made by me: [...] marks that part of the text has been omitted in the quotation. [D] or [d] marks change between uppercase and lowercase letters. [Text in between] is added to clarify what is referred to in actual quotation. When the symbols [] surround text in a footnote, it marks text in the language originally used in a quotation.

learns is considered as an individual who actively seeks to address all implied deficiencies in competence. Thus, neo-liberalism promotes certain ways of being and knowing. It also implies that *how* learning is done, through the collective creation of knowledge, or the exploration of new ways to act and think, lies in the background. As the Swedish professor of Education, Ingrid Carlgren (2014, p. 2) argues, the goal- and result-orientation tend to lead to “a kind of backward pedagogy”³. This is to say that education is governed more by the outcomes than on the exploration and creation of knowledge together.

However, school education cannot be reduced to be only about outcomes. It should provide possibilities for pupils to acquire knowledge and get acquainted with different ways of knowing and learning. It should also promote pupils’ socialization and their development as active, creative and critically thinking citizens that contribute to ongoing changes within society. These missions are interrelated in the educational process (Biesta, 2011; Edling, 2012).

In the Swedish curriculum for compulsory school, it is stated that the school should provide opportunities for learning through different ways of knowing. One mentioned way of knowing is drama. Drama can be a way of knowing a thematic issue or subject-related matter, or to provide possibilities for the experience of using the dramatic art form. Drama is an activity where participants together create and act within a fictive situation, and where theatre techniques are used. The emphasis is on the process where participants experience and explore a phenomenon through dramatic acting together, and in addition sometimes includes dramatic acting for an audience. (See for example Bolton, 1998; Courtney, 1990; Fleming, 2001; Sternudd, 2000.)

However, as the drama researcher Michael Fleming (1999) pointed out now some twenty years ago, the risk of an education dominated by outcomes is a unilateral focus on the product (performance) that obscures the importance of experiencing and meaning-creation together, and that these experiences are both interior and exterior. Even though Fleming refers to drama in education in Britain, where drama in secondary school constitutes a part of the subject of English and has formulated evaluation criteria (GOV. UK, Key Stages 3 and 4), this reasoning has relevance for

³ [en slags baklängespedagogik (p. 2)]

Swedish school education today. A dominating focus on outcomes might also imply an emphasis on the instrumental value of drama for achieving better results in compulsory school subjects, but this is not combined with any education about drama skills and techniques. Then, the lack of knowing how to use actual drama techniques might imply that the pupils' focus is directed towards trying this out and therefore not paying attention to the content of the dramatization. This is one conclusion drawn by Sæbø (2009) in a research study about drama as an integrated form of education in different school subjects. The study was undertaken in Norway where drama is not offered as a subject in the curriculum, and where many teachers have had little drama in their teacher training. The same applies in Sweden. An interview study with teachers undertaken by Fredriksson (2013) indicates that a lack of drama competence, together with requirements to focus on the pupils' achieved results, leads to a situation where drama is marginalized in compulsory school. In the interviews, teachers express the view that even if they perceive drama as a valuable resource for pupils' learning and which contributes to motivation and engagement, drama's process-oriented working form is considered too time-consuming and is therefore not often used. The resulting lack of drama competence may also lead to a situation in which drama education is handed over to drama specialists, and then pursued through often temporary projects. These projects are often realized separately from ordinary schoolwork. Fredriksson (ibid.) concludes that her study points towards a contradiction between drama as an aesthetic form and the school's predominant focus on standardized knowledge requirements. It also points to a dichotomy between creative and explorative learning processes and working forms that in a linear way lead to predetermined knowledge, which privileges a more instrumental approach focusing on academic knowledge and so marginalizing creativity.

Fredriksson (ibid.) highlights that these factors might contribute so that the pupils perceive a division between fun activities such as drama, and the rest of school education. Is this so? This issue gives rise to questions concerning how pupils perceive learning in drama and drama education when it is offered within current school education.

1.1 Overall presentation of the research questions

In this section, an overall presentation of the research questions and point of departure for the thesis are presented.

1.1.1 A dichotomous practice

The prevalence of achievement in education and the privileging of results implies that processes are often chosen based on their effectiveness to lead to such results and outcomes (Biesta, 2011). Processes thus become instrumental in relation to pre-formulated notions of success, rather than a wider exploration of what potentially might be. There is a tendency to emphasize either results or processes in a dichotomous⁴ manner. It is a dichotomy also in that the requirements to measure lead to a simple understanding that knowledge is easily measured. This implies that knowledge can be seen as unambiguously right or wrong (Illeris, 2015), and as pointed out in a report from the National Agency for Education in Sweden (Skolverket, 2013), established knowledge tests both emphasize and align with cognitive capabilities. This contributes to an emphasis on individual cognitive knowledge acquisition, but not on relational and collective learning processes. As a consequence, aesthetic, practical and physical aspects of learning are seen as less important and hence often subordinated.

Thus, there is a prevailing dichotomy between theory and practice, body and mind, and between individual and collective learning. It can also be seen as a separation of ways of knowing.

However, what is seen as important knowledge is not the one given way, only one of many possible. In the present thesis, this argument is related to the philosopher Michel Foucault's (1975/1991) idea that what is considered as important knowledge in a specific social and historical context is discursively formatted. The concept of *discourse* can be understood as a certain way to talk about and define a phenomenon. It is limiting in that it defines what is considered valid, and thereby excludes other ways. As Foucault (1969/1972, p. 49) formulates it, discourses can be defined as "practices that systematically form the object of which they speak". This theory has

⁴ *Dichotomy* means duality and signifies a division into two opposite parts. In the present thesis, the term "dichotomy" is mostly used, while for example Dewey uses the term "dualism". The two terms often are used synonymously, and are understood so here.

relevance for the thesis because it can contribute to an understanding of how active discourses concerning drama, pedagogical trends and prevailing school policy meet within a compulsory school context. (The theory will be further described in a following section 2.1.)

In concrete educational situations, multiple practices are active (Foucault, 1991). The actual policy is interpreted by local decision-makers and teachers, and is conceived in relation to different contextual conditions. As Maguire, Braun and Ball (2015, p. 486) argue, “[p]olicy enactment is a process of social, cultural and emotional construction and interpretation”. This, among other things, can imply that different approaches to learning can be active at the same time and so mutually affect each other.

1.1.2 Learning – a complex activity

A point of departure in this thesis is that learning can be considered a wide and complex activity: that someone learns, something is learned and that this learning takes place as an act. Thus, learning consists of three parts: what takes place with the learner, the activity (process, interaction), and the content being learned (Carlgren, 2010b). Based on this view, it can be argued that all the above-mentioned parts have to be taken into consideration in any concrete educational context. Learning takes place as an active interrelation between the subject (the learner) and the object for learning (the content). This can be understood as that processes of subjectivities, who the subject is, can be and become, must be considered in connection with the process of knowing about the actual object for learning. (Biesta, 2011; Deleuze, 1968/2004; Dewey 1916/2007).⁵

As I mentioned earlier, drama is an activity where participants experience and explore a phenomenon through dramatic acting together. Learning takes place as a complex action simultaneously combining dramatic content, drama techniques, social interplay and oneself. This can be related to Bolton’s (1992) reasoning that drama activities include learning about the content and drama as an art form⁶, and promoting personal and social development. As I understand it, all these components

⁵ In this thesis, learning and processes of subjectivities are considered as interconnected processes mutually affecting each other.

⁶ According to Bolton, learning about drama as art form includes: to learn to act, academic learning about drama, learning the crafts of theatre, and drama’s elements.

are active in drama, but can be more or less foregrounded depending on the purpose and context.

That learning takes place as an activity refers to both the individual's interior understanding and creation of knowledge, and their interaction with others and the environment. Learning is a relational and bodily doing. We experience, act and think in the world as bodies (Deleuze, 1968/2004; Osmond, 2007). Institutionalized, formal school education takes place in a physical place, a place where the physical bodies are interacting with other bodies and with the physical environment. From this, it follows that learning is considered as an embodied act, a complex interplay of body and environment (Clark, 1999; Wright & Rasmussen, 2001).

Taken together, this thesis is based on the view that learning is a multifactorial, complex activity where different components are always already interconnected. It implies a focus on processes where different components are intra-active.⁷ In a drama activity, the components might be, for example, social interplay here-and-now, the dramatic role and context, and the physical space and objects. A *component* is understood here as an active agent (see for example Deleuze & Guattari, 1972/2004). One component affects other related components through a process of complex interaction and exchange. In line with Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988) reasoning, interconnections are seen as processes of movement forces. The relation between such components is not seen as fixed once and for all, but as constantly changing. It implies a focus not only on the components, but on "the process of what goes on between" (Braidotti, 2011, p. 15) them. This reasoning derives from Nomad philosophy, which is one of the theoretical approaches used throughout this thesis. (A more elaborated description of Nomad philosophy will be provided in section 3.2.)

As mentioned above, local practices are an encounter between the active relations of teachers and pupils, within a cultural context of economic and social conditions and

⁷ The term "intra-acting" derives from the post-humanist researcher Karen Barad (2003), and signifies interplays between both human and non-human agents, and where all parties are changed. This differs from the term "interacting" which "presumes the prior existence of independent entities" (Barad, K. (2003). *Posthumanist Performativity: Towards an Understanding of How Matters Comes to Matter*. *Signs*, 28(3), p. 815). In the present thesis, the term intra-acting is used except from when references are used where the term interacting is used.

under the influence of national and global policies and discursive practices. In Sweden, a significant influence is that there is a certain space for local school choices, even though this is regulated by the Education Act (SFS 2010:800). There is thus a certain freedom to decide how time is used and how learning is organized outside of the time plan and formal provision of compulsory subjects. This contributes to the fact that there are some schools where drama is offered as a recurring scheduled subject. In these schools, a drama specialist is employed as a teacher. This in turn leads to questions about what is privileged and further enacted in local drama educational practices, and how drama is perceived by pupils.

1.1.3 Summary

To summarize, the research questions that this thesis deals with concerns what drama can be when it constitutes a recurring part of compulsory school education: which aspects of drama are emphasized: and how drama is integrated within concrete educational practices (if, indeed, it is integrated and which tensions might appear). The questions concern, and further seeks to understand, how prevailing school policy and contemporary approaches to drama are interconnected and, moreover, which factors over time have contributed to this relationship. The question also concerns what is actually realized within and through local practices, which is to ask how such connections may manifest between macro- and micro-level interactions. In this thesis, macro-level influence refers to the political governing of institutionalized education and to the prevailing discursive practices of drama among drama practitioners. Micro-level, in contrast, involves both local preconditions for, and purposes within drama education and so what takes place within situations of concrete drama events in the classroom. This reasoning is inspired by both Foucault's (1976/1990) and Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988) notions that politics at both macro- and micro-levels is thoroughly interconnected.

A subsequent question is: which learning processes are made possible in and through drama education within current compulsory schooling? This expressly concerns *how* such processes of learning take place in concrete drama events, and how these are interconnected with the objects of learning, *what* is learned. A combination of post-constructionism and drama theory are used as a theoretical tool to capture and describe learning processes in drama. Post-constructionism both

includes and transgresses social constructionist thoughts in that not only social interplay but also interconnections between human and non-human agents are brought into focus. This provides a theoretical tool to explore interrelations of materialities (bodies, physical space and objects), social interplay and aesthetic symbols. It can also be a useful tool to capture and describe processes. One such approach is Nomad philosophy, which is used because it implies a focus on processes, in this study more specifically on learning processes within drama. This theoretical approach also contributes a conceptual resource to problematize and critically examine what drama can be about when it constitutes part of the current compulsory school experience. In this thesis, a nomad philosophical approach is put in dialogue with Dewey's educational philosophy. Thereby, the thesis is situated in-between social constructionism and post-humanism. (The theoretical approach will be further described in chapter 3.)

As mentioned above, in Sweden there are a small number of schools where drama is offered as a scheduled subject, even though it is not a compulsory subject in the national curriculum. Thus, a cognate question is: what are the aims and purposes and how is the organization of drama education conceived in these schools? What can learning processes in drama be within this context, and how are drama and learning in drama perceived by the participating pupils?

In the following, I provide a background concerning the context of where the thesis is situated, and how it has guided the enquiry and formulation of research questions. Thereafter, the specified aims of the present study are presented.

1.2 Background

The thesis is situated in a Swedish context, and concerns the encounter of drama and compulsory school education. In this background to the study, I present the current position of drama in the national curriculum, my personal experiences as drama practitioner that have guided the enquiry, and an overview of research about drama within compulsory school education.

1.2.1 Drama in the current Swedish curriculum for compulsory school

The Swedish *Curriculum for compulsory school, preschool class and the recreation centre* (Lgr 11/17)⁸ is the regulation issued by the Swedish Government. It states the fundamental values all school education should be based upon. It also contains the syllabuses for all the compulsory school subjects, with purposes, central content and knowledge requirements for each of these subjects. It is stated in the Education Act (SFS 2010:800) which the compulsory school subjects are. This concept of *curriculum* signifies here the written steering document (Wahlström, 2016b). This concept can have different significations⁹ but in this thesis, it consistently means this Swedish curriculum.

In the following, a description is provided of how drama is positioned in the curriculum. As with other policy documents, it is a somewhat compromise product containing a raft of different discourses (Ball, Maguire & Braun, 2012; Morawski, 2010) that can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Later in the thesis, this will be followed up with a genealogical analysis of how and which discourses over time concerning education and drama have contributed to the current situation (see chapter 2).

The curriculum consists of four parts. The general part of the curriculum contains the fundamental values and overarching goals that should permeate all education. In this part, the school's double mission to foster and provide possibilities for knowledge acquisition is presented. Formulations such as that "[...] education in the school system aims at pupils acquiring and developing knowledge and values" (Lgr 11/17, p. 7)¹⁰ indicate that these missions are considered to be interwoven. Two parts of the curriculum contain the guidelines for the preschool class and recreation centre respectively, and the fourth part provides the syllabuses for the compulsory school subjects. Since this thesis is about compulsory schooling¹¹, I refer only to the general part of the curriculum and the syllabuses.

⁸ In this thesis, The Swedish National Agency for Education's translation to English of education-related words is used (www.skolverket.se).

⁹ The Swedish word *läroplan* is translated as the English *curriculum*. The concept has different significations. The English concept of *curriculum* is wider (Wahlström, 2016b).

¹⁰ [...] utbildningen inom skolväsendet syftar till att elever ska inhämta och utveckla kunskaper och värden (Lgr11/17, p. 7)]

¹¹ The compulsory school in Sweden embraces grades 1-9. From the autumn term of 2018, the pre-school class is also compulsory, but since it is a separate school form, it is not included in this thesis.

In the general part of the curriculum, drama is explicitly mentioned twice. In the section about the school's mission, the following is given:

[The education shall include] a varied and balanced combination of content and working methods. Shared experiences and the social and cultural world that make up the school provide scope as well as the preconditions for learning and development where different forms of knowledge make up a meaningful whole.

[...]

Pupils should have the opportunity of experiencing knowledge in different ways. They should also be encouraged to try out and develop different modes of expression and experience feelings and moods. Drama, rhythm, dance, music and creativity in art, writing and design should all form part of the school's activity. Harmonious development and educational activity provide opportunities for exploring, researching, acquiring and communicating different forms of knowledge and experiences. Creative ability is a part of what the pupils should acquire. (Lgr 11/17, p. 10)¹²

Drama is included here as a way of knowing, and involves both expressing and experiencing. The formulation "harmonious development and educational activity" signifies a concern both the pupil's development as individual and knowledge acquisition. It reflects the school education's double mission to provide possibilities for knowledge, to foster, and to consider these as intimately interconnected. In the same section of the curriculum, it is stated that "[t]he school has the task of imparting fundamental values and promoting pupils' learning in order to prepare them to live and work in society" (Lgr 11/17, p. 9)¹³. According to what is said in the curriculum, the term *foster* refers to socialization into prevailing norms and values and to promote pupils' development to become active and responsible citizens.

¹² "[...] en varierad och balanserad sammansättning av innehåll och arbetsformer. Gemensamma erfarenheter och den sociala och kulturella värld som skolan utgör skapar utrymme och förutsättningar för ett lärande och en utveckling där olika kunskapsformer är delar av en helhet.
[...]

Drama, rytmik, dans, musicerande och skapande i bild, text och form ska vara inslag i skolans verksamhet. En harmonisk utveckling och bildningsgång omfattar möjlighet att pröva, utforska, tillägna sig och gestalta olika kunskaper och erfarenheter. Förmåga till eget skapande hör till det som eleverna ska tillägna sig. (Lgr 11/17, p. 10)]

¹³ "[s]kolan har i uppdrag att överföra grundläggande värden och främja elevernas lärande för att därigenom förbereda dem för att leva och verka i samhället" (Lgr 11, p. 9)]

In the quotation above, the Swedish term for “educational activity” translated literally is “*bildung* process”. (As mentioned in note x, when quoting the curriculum text I use The Swedish National Agency for Education’s translation to English. In this case, the translation becomes misleading.) *Bildung* is a wide and complex concept, but is understood here as an ongoing development comprising the whole person, including ethical judgment, critical thinking and a preparedness to rethink how to understand and relate to the environment (Carlgren, 2012; Illeris, 2015). The concept *bildung* is mentioned, but not defined in the curriculum.

This together indicates that drama is considered as a way to create knowledge, and further to promote socialization and participation in society. This, in turn, can be understood as a notion that drama can be used in all aspects of education.

The second time drama is mentioned in the curriculum is in the section about knowledge goals that the school should take responsibility for ensuring that pupils acquire and develop:

The school is responsible for ensuring that each pupil on completing compulsory school: [...] can use and understand many different forms of expression such as language, art, music, drama and dance, and also has developed an awareness of the range of culture existing in society, (Lgr 11/17, p. 14).¹⁴

Here, drama is presented as a form of expression that pupils can develop knowledge about. However, it is not stated that pupils will have specific knowledge of drama. This implies a disjuncture: that what is previously formulated as a purpose of education is matched only with a vague goal.

However, while drama is not specified as a compulsory school subject, there are formulations in some of the syllabuses that may refer to it. I use the subject Swedish here as an illustrative example, because among all syllabuses Swedish has the most formulations that can be directly related to drama. In the description of purposes and core content in Swedish, it is argued that “[t]hrough the education the pupils should

¹⁴ [Skolan ska ansvara för att varje elev efter genomgången grundskola: [...] kan använda och ta del av många olika uttrycksformer såsom språk, bild, musik, drama och dans samt har utvecklat kännedom om samhällets kulturutbud, (Lgr 11/17, p. 14).]

be given possibilities to develop knowledge about how to formulate own opinions and thoughts in different kind of texts and through different media” (Lgr 11/17, p. 222)¹⁵. Pupils should “be stimulated to use different aesthetic forms of expression” (ibid., p. 222)¹⁶, and “[i]n the encounter with different kinds of texts, Performing Arts and other aesthetic narration, the pupils shall be given the conditions to develop their language, their own identities and their understanding of the world” (ibid., p. 222)¹⁷. It is argued also that education should include knowledge about “how gestures and body language can affect an [oral] presentation” (ibid., p. 224)¹⁸ and that pupils should meet different forms of literary texts among these dramatic texts. In the subsequent knowledge requirements for the subject of Swedish, the only formulation related to the above is that the pupil should have knowledge about how to combine texts with different aesthetic expressions so that these together reinforce the actual message. Thus, the syllabus for Swedish opens up the possibility (but not the mandatory requirement) to include drama in the process of learning and teaching.

The presentation above about drama in the Swedish curriculum started with the general part that contains the school’s mission and overarching goals that should permeate all education. However, the dominating focus on achievements of standardized results seems to lead to a situation where knowledge requirements govern the organization of concrete education (Carlgren, 2014; Wahlström & Sundberg, 2015). Instead of the overarching objectives recurring in the educational process of each subject, specific knowledge requirements tend to govern formal education. In the curriculum, general competences¹⁹, that is competences that are “multidimensional, functional and integrated capabilities useful in various contexts” (Wahlström & Sundberg, 2015, p. 8)²⁰ are indirectly formulated. That is to say, they are mentioned but not explicitly referred to as competences. Examples of general

¹⁵ [”Genom undervisningen ska eleverna ges möjligheter att utveckla kunskaper om hur man formulerar egna åsikter och tankar i olika slags texter och genom skilda medier” (Lgr 11/17, p. 222).]

¹⁶ [”stimuleras till att uttrycka sig genom olika estetiska uttrycksformer” (ibid, p. 222)]

¹⁷ [”I mötet med olika texter, scenkonst och annat berättande ska eleverna ges förutsättningar att utveckla sitt språk, sin egen identitet och sin förståelse av omvärlden” (ibid., p. 222).]

¹⁸ [”hur gester och kroppsspråk kan påverka en [...] presentation” (ibid., p. 224)]

¹⁹ Wahlström and Sundberg refer to the OECD’s (www.oecd.org) definition, and to the EU’s formulation of key competences (https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/school/key-competences-and-basic-skills_en).

²⁰ [”multidimensionella, funktionella och integrerade förmågor som är användbara i olika sammanhang” (Wahlström & Sundberg, 2015, p. 8)]

competences are creativity, problem-solving and social competence, and these are mentioned in the curriculum as follows:

The school should stimulate pupils' creativity, curiosity and self-confidence, as well as their desire to explore their own ideas and solve problems. Pupils should have the opportunity to take initiatives and responsibility, and develop their ability to work both independently and together with others. (Lgr11/17, p. 9)²¹

As Wahlström and Sundberg (2015) point out, in the Swedish curriculum competences refer to capabilities within the school subjects. They mainly concern cognitive capabilities that are related to the central content and knowledge requirement for the subjects. This produces an emphasis on subject-specific and cognitive aspects of knowledge. The prevailing focus on results within Swedish education contributes to the specification of knowledge and knowledge requirements in syllabuses that impact and govern the set-up of education in classrooms (Carlgren, 2014). This in turn implies that drama has a marginalized position in the curriculum.

However, as mentioned above, in the general part of the curriculum, drama is included as a way of knowing, and thereby it can be included within education in all the compulsory subjects. As a way of knowing, it may be a resource for learning concerning general competences and value-related issues, as well as subject-specific matters. Additionally, as mentioned earlier (p. 8), in Sweden there is a space for local school choices, and drama education therefore can be offered as a subject in schools. Thus, the policy documents can be interpreted and enacted in different ways in different local practices (Maguire, Braun & Ball, 2015; Morawski, 2010). Taken together, these conditions have created an impetus to question what drama can be about when it is offered continuously within the context of compulsory schooling in Sweden.

²¹ [Skolan ska stimulera elevernas kreativitet, nyfikenhet och självförtroende samt deras vilja att pröva och omsätta idéer i handling och lösa problem. Eleverna ska få möjlighet att ta initiativ och ansvar samt utveckla sin förmåga att arbeta såväl självständigt som tillsammans med andra. (Lgr11/17, p. 9)]

The enquiry is also based on my personal experiences as a drama practitioner. This suggests that I can never position myself outside the actual research field but am rather a co-constructing agent and hence implicated throughout the study.

1.2.2 My personal entrance

As a professional drama pedagogue, I have been teaching drama in Swedish compulsory schools, preschools, and voluntary theatre activities, for more than thirty years. For many years, I was employed by the Cultural Department in a bigger municipality, and this applied to leading theatre groups for children and youths in a Culture center, as well as teaching drama in compulsory schools and preschools.

Concerning the latter, I was engaged in drama education by the School Department in this municipality. In schools, drama education was organized in various ways and with different and diverse aims. The focus could be either on learning in drama as an art form or through drama as a method for specific subject matters or themes, depending on the particular mission and aim. The contact from schools was often taken by teachers who wanted professional support because of their own lack of education in drama. The class teachers participated in the classroom, and then often as observers. This provided opportunities for teachers to gain useful insights into, and further discuss possibilities for, drama within education. Mostly, drama education was organized as a lesson every week during one school term. Towards the end of a term with drama it seemed that the pupils had enough knowledge in drama as a form of expression to also focus more on the dramatic content and reflections about this. For me, these experiences gave rise to questions about how learning takes place in drama, and how drama as an aesthetic form and content-based experience are interconnected. One question concerned the significance of recurrent drama education for these learning processes.

The questions for this enquiry also crystalized around an experience I had during a period in which I worked as a drama teacher in school where drama was offered as a scheduled subject. For some time, I was part time employed in the municipality, and so one day every week, I worked in this school, a free school for compulsory school education. The school had as its profile aesthetic forms of expression, and this implies that aesthetic expressions were used as a way of knowing in all school subjects. In addition to the aesthetic subjects of Music and Visual art that are

compulsory in the national curriculum, drama was offered as a scheduled subject for all pupils in grade 3-9.²² I taught drama in some of the classes, which included creating and performing dramatizations, inquiry and reflections about social interplay, and learning about thematic content through drama. There was a special drama room, which allowed for working processes of embodied and aesthetic explorations and the opportunities to create meaning together. During this period, I had informal conversations with the pupils about their perceptions of drama as a scheduled subject and what it then can be about. This, in turn, has contributed to my interest to know more about how drama, and learning in drama can be perceived and experienced by pupils.

One question that has grown during my experiences as a drama practitioner concerns the interrelation of social interaction, bodily interaction with the physical space and objects, and interior experiencing. I illustrate this with a concrete memory from my employment at the Cultural Department and work to lead theatre groups for children and youths at a Culture center:

A theatre group for young people was collectively creating a performance based on a common idea. An overall idea about the plot was formulated, and they successively created the role characters and the concrete actions. One of the participants early in the working process found a pair of shoes that became important in her creation of the role character. The shoes had heels, albeit not high, and because she usually not used shoes with heels, using these affected her moves. She successively used these moves to bodily express her interpretation of the role character. Even though she then added other garments and props for the character, the shoes were most important. On one occasion, she almost stumbled because one of the heels stuck in a slip between two stage floor modules. Then she took up this stumbling as a movement that symbolized that the role character thought that she had a balanced control over the life situation, but did not observe for example, the responses and signals from others, and she therefore figuratively “stumbled”. Thus, to stumble led to changes in her way to act both bodily and in relation to the co-actors in role. The co-actors, in turn, took this up in

²² The above-mentioned school does not offer drama as scheduled subject today, and the conditions for drama there relate to school policy in Sweden and changes in this.

the interplay between her and their role characters, and this contributed to the continued creation of social interactions between the role characters in the dramatization.

This return to one of my key memory images of drama practice, exemplifies that the bodily intra-action with objects and space can lead to an experience and symbolic creation that in turn can affect the interplay with other role characters. My question related to this concerns the interrelations of emotions, thoughts, physical expressing, physical space and objects, and social interplay and how such interrelations might contribute to the creation of meaning in drama processes.

Today, I am teaching drama within teacher education. One of the requirements for teacher education is that it will provide possibilities for prospective teachers to get knowledge and skills within the aesthetic field. This implies that, as a drama teacher, I will create opportunities for learning in drama as a form of expression and as an integrated part in various subjects throughout the curriculum. Questions about what drama can be about within school education, and about how and in which different ways it is possible to learn in drama, are continuously central issues for me as a drama teacher.

In order to find out what is known about learning in drama education within compulsory schooling, in the following section I present an overview of some previous research.

1.2.3 Previous research about learning in drama

In this overview, a point of departure for the search for research studies has revolved around questions regarding what drama can be about within current compulsory schooling, and how learning in drama then can take place. Questions concern which factors contribute to the actual conditions for and purposes of drama and which aspects of drama are included in concrete educational practices. This is related to how learning in drama as subject and through drama as resource for different subject matters is described, and also based on which theoretical approaches are employed.

A pertinent question is: are pupils' voices heard and, if so, which methods have been used to produce and report these?

1.2.3.1 Learning processes in drama

There are several research studies about drama as a resource in school education, and where expression, experiencing and reflection are mentioned as key aspects in learning in and through drama. However, there seem to be relatively few studies with a specific emphasis on how these key aspects are working in learning processes.

Gallagher (2007, p. 1234) argued that "drama is still struggling to account for what is learned even before entertaining the more complex dilemma of how it is (creatively) is learned". Today, twelve years later, this still seems to be valid. The studies I have found that emphasize how learning takes place in and through drama were undertaken by Sæbø (2009), Henry (2000), Gallagher (2000), and Wright and Rasmussen (2001). They all highlight expression, experiencing and reflection, and discuss the relationship between different elements as well as of interior and exterior experiencing in relation to learning processes in drama.

Experiencing can refer to interior experiencing, involving emotional, sensory and cognitive experiencing and, also, to experiencing through exterior action. Sæbø (2009) refers to both aspects in her reasoning that aesthetic experiencing is central in learning in drama. References are made to Dewey's thought about aesthetic experiencing as a dimension of education and to Gadamer's thought that the subject creates understanding through embodied and mental experiencing. According to Sæbø (2009, 2011), there is a relationship between the individual, phenomenological experiencing, and the social construction of meaning. She points at the creation of knowledge is depending on the subject's possibilities to do connections between the fictive situation and her own life world. Sæbø (2009) undertook an empirical study, involving twenty class teachers, twelve classes and eight Norwegian schools, where both role play and process drama were used. Data was produced through classroom observations and interviews with teachers. The teachers had varied competence in drama, but no one was a drama specialist. A conclusion in her study was that the teachers' knowledge about drama and group process greatly affect pupils' opportunities for support and challenges during the process, and for learning in and through drama. The aesthetic experiencing, social interaction and possibilities for

reflection appear as significant for pupils' engagement and learning in and through drama.

Henry (2000) also discusses the relationship between interior experiencing and exterior action and interaction. Based on an analysis of the drama theoretician Richard Courtney, she focuses on processes of learning through drama, and argues that drama activates feelings and imaginations, which in turn generate a metaphorical understanding. This reasoning is related to Courtney's (1995, p. 23) idea that "metaphors and symbols are charged with feelings". Dramatic action is considered as representations of metaphors (Courtney, 1990). According to Henry, the moving between the actual context and the imagination can imply the exploration of different perspectives in the process of dramatic action, and so lead to learning. She suggests that drama is a useful resource for learning especially within the social sciences. In the learning process, the subject connects experiencing in the dramatic action with experiences in the personal life. Henry emphasizes the relationship between emotion, cognition, and action, and then action concerns dramatic action, embodied action and social interaction.

Gallagher (2000) conducted a research study in drama classes in a Canadian high school, and she draws the conclusion that drama education can promote different kinds of learning. The study highlights learning concerning aesthetic expressions, cognitive aspects of learning by processing information and alternative perspectives, collective processes of creation of meaning, and personal development. Gallagher (2000, p. 55) argues that "[l]earning through drama happens through engagement in the activity" in the interrelation of exterior expression, and interior experiencing and imagination. Engagement can be related to physical and/or verbal participation in the dramatic action (as 'participant-actors'), and to participation as observers ('participant-audience').

Two other drama researchers, Wright and Rasmussen (2001), in a joint article discuss how drama as a way of knowing can contribute to learning. They highlight diverse elements that can be included in a drama process: emotion, reflection, imagination, sensory experiencing, language, and embodied learning. They refer to these elements as "intra- and interpersonal skills" (Wright and Rasmussen, 2001, p. 222) that are inter-connected. Their reasoning is related to two action research projects, one by Wright in Australia, and one by Rasmussen in Norway, and they draw the conclusion that drama can be a powerful way of knowing because diverse

elements are inter-connected. However, in the article they do not describe how these elements can work together in a drama process.

Sæbø, and Wright and Rasmussen have undertaken research studies in drama projects. Because drama in education is mostly used temporally and in relation to a specific project or theme, this is reflected in the research that I have found.

Gallagher's study was conducted in a high school where drama is offered as an arts option. However, there seem not to be so many research studies about educational practices where drama is offered recurrently within compulsory schooling. One exception is when drama is employed as a resource in language education.

As mentioned earlier, in Britain drama constitutes a part in the subject of English, and drama as a resource for language skills has been focused on by various researchers, in Britain as well as in other countries (for example Holmgren-Lind, 2007; Jacquet, 2011; O'Toole & Stinson, 2013; Polozny, 2000). While Polozny (2000) meta-analysed research studies about drama's effect on verbal skills, these other studies were undertaken as projects aimed to support pupils' oral or written skills. All the studies show that the possibilities to express oneself with voice, gestures and facial expressions and to explore different communicative modes through dramatic acting in a fictive context contributed to more elaborated oral or written enunciations. This can be related to what O'Toole and Stinson (2013, p. 160) point out, that drama is "the art form of the spoken word and of gesture and the body".

Drama as a resource for language skill is an example of drama as art form connected to subject -related content. Another example where there can be a connection between drama as art form and content is process drama.²³ (See for example Bolton,

²³ Sæbø's (2011) definition of "process drama" is applied here: "Process drama is a teacher structured, creating, pupil active, and group based learning form where the pupils with different drama techniques and role play develop knowledge in the subject where drama is integrated. [...] The characteristic is that the pupils, and sometimes the teacher, are working in role and that these role plays are integrated with other creative strategies for learning..." (p. 100). ["Processdrama är en lärarstrukturerad, skapande, elevaktiv och gruppbaserad inlärningsform där eleverna med hjälp av olika tekniker och rollspel utvecklar kunskap i det ämne där drama integreras. [...] Det karaktäristiska är att eleverna, och emellanåt läraren, arbetar i roll och att dessa rollspel integreras med andra kreativa strategier för lärande... (p. 100).] (Sæbø, A. (2011). *Ledarrollen i processdrama*. In Österlind, E. (Ed.) *Drama – ledarskap som spelar roll* (pp. 99-118).

I am aware of that this definition does not cover all variants and aspects of process drama, but it is useful in the actual reasoning.

1998.) Process drama is used in several countries, but in Sweden it is rarely practiced within educational contexts (Österlind & Hallgren, 2014).²⁴ An exception are the intervention studies undertaken by Lindqvist (1995) in Swedish preschools and compulsory schools, where process drama has been used for learning as well as the development of language and play.

In the earlier mentioned Norwegian study of Sæbø (2009), process drama was used in the subject of History. In other classes in the same study, process drama or role play were connected with a value-related theme: friendship. There are several research studies concerning drama as an educational resource to promote social relations, and to highlight value-related issues. Examples of this are conflict management (DRACON international, 2005), drama as ethical education (Edmiston, 2000), intercultural education (Fleming, 2006), and democracy and social awareness (Adams & Owens, 2016; Gallagher, 2011; Neelands, 2009).

Issues are explored in dramatic actions and reflection together. Sternudd (2000), who has done an overview of drama's potential in relation to democratic fostering, argues that reflection and dramatic acting are interrelated in a drama process. She draws the conclusion that different approaches to drama in education can contribute to different purposes and content for reflection, and that it can be both about reflection-in-action and reflection-on action²⁵ (see also Schön, 1983/1991). However, "the reflection in all [drama pedagogical] perspectives, contains both self-reflection and reflection about concepts, events and enunciations" (Sternudd, 2000, p. 173)^{26, 27}.

Gallagher's and Neelands' studies are also examples of drama projects where social issues and theatre-making are interrelated. Swedish research studies about the collective making of scenic productions within a compulsory school context are Olsson's (2006) study about theatre productions, and Törnquist's (2000, 2006) studies of a musical performance. Common to these studies is the use of a social constructionist perspective, and that the collective creation, social interaction and use of different communicative modes contribute to personal and social development,

²⁴ However, there is now a tendency for process drama to become somewhat more common in Sweden.

²⁵ Sternudd bases this reasoning on Schön's (1983/1991) idea about reflection.

²⁶ ["reflexionen i alla [dramapedagogiska] perspektiv innehåller både självreflexion och reflexion kring begrepp, händelser och utsagor" (Sternudd, 2000, p. 173)]

²⁷ The drama pedagogical perspectives formulated by Sternudd are presented in section 1.3.1.

and learning about social processes as well as the art form. The focus is on learning as a situated doing.

This selective but representative overview indicates that research studies within the drama field often focus on learning as a socially situated and communicative process. There are research studies where the aspects of dramatic art form, thematic or subject-related content, and aspects concerning personal growth and social relations are in focus, but they are not all given equal weight in any one single study. Internationally there are few studies illuminating the interrelation between learning, and processes of subjectivities, but hitherto there is no single Swedish study focusing on this intra-action.

Cognitive processes are mentioned in relation to imagination, metaphorical and symbolic thinking, and also in relation to reflection, but are seldom given explicit focus. Beside Courtney (1990) who is mentioned above in relation to Henry's (2000) study, and Gallagher's (2000) study, only Duffy (2012, 2015) has explicitly emphasized the significance of cognition in drama processes. This conclusion is in line with Österlind's (2009) overview of drama research in Sweden that shows that cognitive perspectives are rarely considered in studies, and this appears to apply internationally.

Bodily action can be defined as embodied experiencing, a medium for expressing, and physical interaction with a physical environment. According to what appears in the research studies presented here, the focus lies mainly on the body as experiencing and expressing. However, it seems that the physical body is given little attention within drama research. It might be that the physical body often is often taken as given, as Franks (1996) says. Gallagher (2015) suggests that a contributing factor to the body's invisibility within research reports is that the written form obscures corporeality. This being the case, in the following I will take a closer look at how the body has been considered within drama research.

1.1.3.2 The body and the physical space in drama research

Studies that have a specific focus on the body in drama education have been undertaken by Franks (2015b) and by Osmond (2007). Osmond discusses three ways to see the body (as knower, as a medium for aesthetic expression, and as doer), and connects these ways to drama and to different theatre traditions.

“The body as knower” refers to the idea that the world is perceived and experienced through senses, emotions and the mind. Memories are stored in the body and mind. This approach is related to Merleau-Ponty’s idea that the individual experiences both the physical and the social world through the lived body. Osmond also relates it to Stanislavskij’s system for acting training, where the interior emotions and experiences are considered as a basis for formation of an exterior expression of a role. According to the drama researcher Puszta (2000), these methods have been adapted and simplified within drama and can for example, be used in order to provide possibilities for increased self-awareness.

“The body as a medium for aesthetic expression” refers to the thought that “in drama the body itself is the medium” (Osmond, 2007, p. 1115). This implies that it is the body that concretizes and transforms the actor’s communicative intentions. This approach can to some degree be related to Ahlstrand’s (2014) research study about theatre education within Swedish upper secondary school. In her study, the focus lies on which performative capabilities are developed, and how these are learned. One of her conclusions is that theatre skills are a form of specific bodily knowledge, “*Bodybildung*” (Ahlstrand, 2014, p. 201-203, and p. 224).

“The body as doer” refers to the body’s interaction in the social and physical world. This is considered as an active relationship between corporeal movements and gestures, and the environment, whereby culturally and socially inscribed meanings are negotiated, explored and reinforced or changed. Osmond exemplifies this with Boal’s (1974/2000) thoughts about theatre as an investigation of possibilities to relate to a situation. Then, physical action and critical reflection about a situation are used in parallel. This is also discussed by Franks, who makes a connection to Butler’s thoughts about the material body as “a cultural signifier, embodying histories and sets of possibilities (the possibility of transformation or what we might become)” (Franks, 1996, p. 113).

Both Franks and Osmond argue that the significance of the body in knowing processes has to be given more attention if the dichotomy between body and mind is to be dissolved in terms of conceptualizing the learning process. They both point out that there is little research with an emphasis on the body and my own overview confirms this.

The fact that the body is given little attention in drama research is related to the fact that the interrelation with the physical environment is seldom emphasized. Drama is embodied doing in a physical place, and simultaneously about a fictive context. As Franks (2015a, p. 231) says, “the situation of drama – its settings, costume, lighting effects and so forth contribute to the making of dramatic meaning”. The students’ interaction with space in dramatic acting is one focus in Ahlstrand’s (2014) study about theatre education in upper secondary school, and also in Haagensen’s (2014) study about young people’s creation of devised performances. However, I have not found any study about drama in compulsory school education where the interaction with the physical space is emphasized.

1.1.3.4 Pupils’ voices about learning in drama education

In reviewing the literature, it also becomes clear that in empirical studies, methods to construct data are mostly in the form of observations and with interviews often being undertaken as a complement to observation. However, in the majority of interview studies it seems that teachers are informants but not the pupils. In the above-mentioned studies, Olsson (2006), and Sæbø (2009) interviewed teachers, in addition to carrying out observations. In a Swedish educational context, interview studies with teachers have been undertaken by Elsner (2000), Fredriksson (2013), and Öfverström (2006). Törnquist (2006), in her doctoral thesis, undertook an interview study with teachers, while in her licentiate thesis²⁸ (2000) she interviewed pupils to elicit their perceptions about working with a musical performance. Jacquet (2011) undertook interviews with participating pupils in addition to observations. However, there are few drama research studies where pupils are informants.

Beside Jacquet’s and Törnquist’s licentiate thesis, I found one Swedish research study where pupils were asked about their perceptions: Österlind’s (2011b) study concerning pupils’ experiences of theatre education within upper secondary school. Nor do there seem to be many studies internationally where pupils are interviewed about drama education. Gallagher (2000, 2011) has used interviews with pupils in schools, together with other methods to produce data about experiences in drama

²⁸ A licentiate thesis is a research thesis for the academic degree licentiate, and it corresponds approximately to half a doctoral degree. In the present overview, the Swedish studies of Fredriksson (2013), Holmgren-Lind (2007), Jacquet (2011), Olsson (2006), Törnquist (2000), and Öfverström (2006) are licentiate thesis’.

education. In her analysis, a focus is placed on both what is learned and how this learning takes place.

Chan (2009), and Innes, Moss and Smigiel (2001) interviewed pupils in compulsory schools, about their experiences and perceived learning through drama. Chan's study concerns drama as a pedagogical method within other subjects, while Innes et al. realized series of drama workshops in two schools, and interviewed the participants after these. What was common for the interview studies of Chan (2009) and Innes et al. (2001) is a focus on experiences, and on *what* is learned through drama/theatre education, but little focus is placed on pupils' perceptions of *how* they learn.

1.1.3.5 Summary of previous research

According to the overview of previous research, there is a focus on how drama is used in school education and its possibilities to promote pupils' learning, but the tensions between drama and otherwise realized school education are seldom discussed. Few studies have a specific emphasis on how learning takes place in drama or on how pupils perceive drama education as part of compulsory schooling. It would seem there are few research studies about compulsory schooling where drama is offered as a recurring part of education, and, certainly, no one that deals with this in a Swedish context.

This makes it interesting to undertake a study about how learning takes place in drama, when it constitutes a continuous part of compulsory school education in Sweden.

1.3 Aim and research questions

The aim and research questions have been formulated based on the issues presented in the background to this research study.

The overall aim of the research study described in this thesis is to contribute to knowledge regarding what drama can be and how learning takes place in and through drama education when it constitutes a recurring part of compulsory schooling in

Sweden. A sub-aim is to produce understanding concerning the components that co-produce such learning.

The research questions guiding the design of the research study and the analysis of data are:

What characterizes drama education when realized within the current compulsory school system in Sweden?

How can learning processes in and through drama be understood through a post-constructionist perspective?

Which components are active in learning processes in drama education, and how are these interconnected?

How is learning in and through drama perceived by participating pupils?

This thesis seeks to contribute to knowledge regarding what drama, and learning in and through drama, can be about in local practices within an educational system dominated by a neo-liberal ideology. A key point of departure is that educational practices on macro- and micro-levels are interconnected. Therefore, a genealogical analysis of discursive formations of drama education as part of the compulsory school system in Sweden, and an empirical study of local drama educational practices are undertaken. In the genealogical analysis, the main focus lies on change over time and how such change may have contributed to how practices are today. In the empirical study, the key focus lies on the organization of space and time for drama education and on which learning processes are enabled through this. To examine this, focus is placed on the components that co-produce such processes in concrete drama events.

A delimitation is done in that the research study not explicitly focus the drama teachers' way to teach. Certainly, the teachers' specialization in drama is a significant component for the drama educational practices. However, a focus on the teachers would warrant a whole research study in itself, and which among other things would require a discussion about teacher training in drama in Sweden.

The empirical study is an example of how drama can be practised within a national educational context, and so it provides a contribution to the discussion about what

drama education can be within school education and which learning processes then are made possible.

1.4 Definition of drama

The present thesis is about drama and, therefore, in this section I provide my understanding and definition of drama employed throughout, including specific concepts relating to drama and its application to this enquiry.

The term *drama* is used because this is the most common term used internationally to refer to the form that takes place in the mainstream school. *Drama* is the term used in the current Swedish curriculum (Lgr 11/17) and this is also an argument why I use it throughout this study. In Sweden, the most common term is *dramapedagogik* (in English; ‘drama pedagogy’ or ‘educational drama’), and so points to the fact that it is both an art subject and a method that can support different aspects of knowledge. However, there is an important pedagogical dimension embedded in all subjects relating to school education without any such ‘pedagogy’ in their names, as for example Music or Swedish, and so this is another reason why I use the term *drama*.

1.4.1 A multifaceted field

Drama, theatre and play share many of the same roots as performative activities (Schechner, 2003). They have in common the fact they take place in limited, real-life time and space while simultaneously operating symbolically in time and space. Drama’s artistic expression is theatre, and theatre techniques are applied, which implies that it is an arts-based subject. In a dramatic play, the focus lies on the creative and explorative process together. Thereby, drama works in the space in-between theatre and play. Drama is an *aesthetic* field in that it can include sensory perceptions and experiences, sensory and emotional sensations, and art form-related impressions and expressions (see for example Fleming 2012; Rasmussen, 2013b).

A wide and encompassing description of drama is that it is an aesthetic field that is based on interaction in groups and acting in role.

In drama pedagogical activities, imagination and artistic symbols are used when people together create fictitious situations about the reality. [...] The participants experience this situation with their bodies, emotions and intellect, both as co-creators of the situation and as observers of the situation. In the processing of the role play, the dramatization, or the form that is used, a reflection process is made possible whose content depend on the purpose with the activity. (Sternudd 2000, p.16)²⁹

Thus, there are common characteristics for drama as a field. Dramatic acting in role, the creative process, communication and reflection are all considered central aspects in drama. In drama activities, thought, emotion and action are interconnected (Lepp, 1998). I understand *action* as bodily action, dramatic action and as social interaction. Bodily action include experiencing, expressing, and physical interaction with the physical space. Simultaneously, drama is a multifaceted field that is practised in different ways and with different purpose in different contexts.

As a way to describe the versatility of drama, the perspectives formulated by the Swedish drama researcher Mia-Marie Sternudd (2000) are used (the art-oriented perspective, the personal development perspective, the critical thinking perspective and the holistic learning perspective). These perspectives are based on different assumptions concerning goals, focus and possibilities for reflections in drama, and can be seen as theoretical constructions that in practice overlap with each other.³⁰

The *art-oriented perspective* focuses on the communicative and creative capacity through interaction with others in the process of creating and staging a play. The *personal development perspective* is where phenomena concerning human conditions are investigated through common experiences in groups. The common reflection focuses on group dynamics and experiences together in role-plays. The *critical thinking perspective* involves the inquiry and analysis of social injustice and conflict, through socio-analytic role play, Forum theatre and so forth. The *holistic learning perspective* involves participants achieving an understanding of thematic content

²⁹ [I dramapedagogisk verksamhet används fantasi och konstnärliga symboler när människor tillsammans skapar fiktiva situationer av verkligheten. [...] Deltagarna upplever situationen med sina kroppar, känslor och intellekt, både som medskapare av situationen och som betraktare av situationen. I bearbetning av rollspelet, dramatiseringen eller den form som används, möjliggörs en reflexionsprocess vars innehåll påverkas av syftet med verksamheten. (Sternudd, 2000, p. 16)]

³⁰ Sternudd's (2000) perspectives are based on an international overview of drama approaches, and is frequently used within the Swedish drama context in order to describe the drama field, for example by the researchers Fredriksson (2013), Hägglund (2001), and Jacquet (2011).

through collective inquiry, and in the drama process, participants switch between acting and reflection on the theme in focus.

This versatility has contributed to drama, in some contexts, being focused upon as method and in others as an art form. Drama as method implies an emphasis on its instrumental value as a means for other objectives, while drama as art form implies an emphasis on its intrinsic values as a specific form of art (Elsner, 2000; Fredriksson, 2013). In the Nordic countries, these views have been discussed since the 1960s until the turn of the century: that is whether drama should be defined as art form or as method (Rasmusson, 2000). A similar discussion was debated in United Kingdom during the 1980s and 1990s. For example, Bolton (1984) argues that learning takes place through drama as an educational tool, while Hornbrook (1998) represents the view that learning takes place with drama as art form. However, today the prevailing view within the drama field is that drama embraces a plurality of uses and manifestations. It is not possible to give one single definition applicable in all situations because different aspects of drama come into the foreground depending on the purpose, context and different approaches to drama. This implies an integrated view of drama (Fleming, 1999, 2001).

In the following section, I provide a description of concepts that are significant for drama and for how drama is understood in this thesis.

1.4.2 Central drama concepts

Dramatic action is considered as a core of drama (Courtney, 1990, 1995; Sternudd, 2000), and relates to both the fictional context for dramatic acting and acting in role. Acting in role involves an action going on simultaneously here-and-now and in a fictive context. A dramatic form is made up of several *elements*, for example time and space, tension, symbols, mood, and roles (O'Toole, 1992). The elements can be employed together in different ways depending on used drama genre and the actual context, that is to say, the purpose for the drama activity and the participating group.

A basis is the view that a dramatic act is a bodily doing that includes emotions and thoughts, and the acting *as if*.

Drama is Being “as if”
(Courtney, 1990, p. ix)

The concept of fiction is simultaneously a mental, interior creation and exterior doing, in dramatization. Courtney (1990, p. ix) defines *as if* as an interior and exterior process “that occurs when we transform our creative imagination into acts, when we create mental fictions and express them in spontaneous play, creative drama, improvisation, role play, and theatre”. The fiction is made up by the chosen thematic focus, and the participants’ different experiences, memories, and ideas. Thereby, the fiction works within the actual context, “[i]t is a particular framing of aspects of the real” (O’Toole, 1992, p. 51). The concept of *framing* signifies “the overall frame within which the re-enactment takes place” (ibid., p. 110). I understand a frame as an agreed, fictive setting within which the participants can explore the event with different approaches, or with other words from different positions in relation to their role and others’ roles. A frame can also provide a space for exploration of a fictive situation and related thematic topic, and different ways to relate to and/or change this through acting in role.

To *act in role* can involve pretending to represent a character as authentically as possible, or to present the role as an exterior doing. However, an actor can always insert her own interpretation and way to express the role, and thereby it is not a mere imitation (Bolton, 1992; Rasmussen, 2008). This reasoning is related to an extended understanding of the term *mimesis*. As Rasmussen (2008) points out, a traditional definition of mimesis as imitation is connected with a view of knowledge as something pre-given that can be imposed. Another understanding of mimesis is that it is not about a copy, but a representation. Then, the role represents a reality outside the dramatic context. This rests on the assumption that there is a true reality out there that can be known about. A third way to understand mimesis is that the dramatic context constitutes a frame that represents something in the real life, but that within this frame it is possible to create “new realities, new realistic actions” (Rasmussen, 2008, p. 314). This implies a view that new understanding can be created both about the phenomenon in focus, and about oneself. Yet another understanding of mimesis is that the dramatic action implies a creative process of inquiry and change of “the subject, object and symbolic media” (ibid., p. 315). Then the dramatic frame also can

be changed during the process. This can for example be about experimental and improvisational working forms.

In this thesis, the last two definitions of the term *mimesis* are used in that the dramatic context is considered as a frame, but a frame that is not always stable.

In drama, different modes are used in the communication and creation of an expression. This includes verbal utterances, voice, gestures, facial expressions, and positions in relation to the others. It can also be about positions in and arrangements of the physical space, and the use of objects and sound. Different modes are used simultaneously, and thus the creation of meaning and expression in drama is seen as *multimodal* (Østern, 2011).

To act in role implies a possibility for *reflection* both in role and about role. Because the subject can regard herself and the co-actors both in the physically and socially situated action and in role, possibilities for distancing and reflection are created. The consciousness about 'I' and about the role implies a *double consciousness* which can be used for reflections about activities and phenomenon. The simultaneous acting in the physical and social context, and the fictive context implies that reflection can concern the role, oneself, and co-actors in role and out of role (Bolton, 1986, 1992; Østern & Heikkinen, 2001).

Østern and Heikkinen (2001) suggest that this space in-between the fictional construction of a dramatic action, and the physical and social context implies that this double consciousness can be termed *aesthetic doubling*. However, simultaneously as it is about an interrelation of the actual and the fictive, it is also about reflection about other participants and oneself out of role. Thereby, the process includes aspects that can be active in different social interplay, not only drama. When referred to exclusively as the space in-between the fictional construction and the physical and social context, the term *aesthetic doubling* is used in this thesis, or otherwise the term *double consciousness* is used.

Reflection can take place both in action and about actions. The simultaneous experience of this doubling comprises reflection *in action*. As Courtney (1990) points out, the interior, mental activity while playing involves thinking about what we do, how we do it and the assessment of what we are doing, in connection to this double consciousness. "These logical elements intersect on the planes of space and time, in

the “here-and-now” (Courtney, 1990, p. 84). This can be understood as that these elements are working together in the process of reflection in action. Said in Courtney’s words, “[a]cting is thinking on the feet” (ibid. p. 90). Reflections *about* actions in drama can for example be about stopping the fictive plot and together verbally reflecting about what has been taking place and what may be the next step in the dramatized action. It can also be about verbal reflection afterwards, with a purpose to share experiences and to gain an increased awareness and understanding of what has been occurring. Thereby, an *aesthetic distancing* is made possible, which among other things can imply seeing a phenomenon from different perspectives and to inquire on new alternatives for acting (Eriksson, 2009).

Thus, reflection and dramatic acting are working together in a drama process, even though different approaches to drama can offer different possibilities for reflection. A common feature is that it can be about both self-reflection, and an ongoing inquiry of different points of view and possibilities for action (Neelands, 2006; Sternudd, 2000, 2017; Rasmussen, 2013b)³¹.

When someone is a spectator of a performed dramatization, a process of double consciousness can also be active. To watch a dramatization is to take part of an action that occurs here-and now in the real context, and simultaneously as a fictive context, and it includes both the acting person and the fictive character in action. The spectator can engage in the action with intellect, senses and emotions (Bundy, Ewing & Fleming, 2013). The spectator can make connections to their own experiences, and can be aware of new ways to act and react to phenomenon in the world. To take part of a dramatization as spectator can imply the possibility to reflect on actions or phenomena. To be a spectator is to actively take part and respond to the dramatic action. Thereby a drama performance can be understood as an event that includes the interaction between actors and spectators (see for example Bundy et. al., 2013; Fischer-Lichte, 2004/2008).

Dramatic acting is “an ensemble art form” (Sawyer, 2015, p. 251), since a creation of a dramatic play involves all participants’ active contribution and collaboration. Thereby, *ensemble* signifies both a noun (a group), and an adverb (how a creation of a play is done). In this thesis, *ensemble* is defined as a process where creating a

³¹ See also the reasoning about reflection and reflexivity in section 4.2.4.

dramatic action and the social interplay are interconnected (see Neelands, 2009). In drama education, the creation of a dramatization can be seen as a *collective* process because all participants' ideas and actions contribute to this creation. Different working tasks are employed by the participants.³² By doing different working tasks, the participants take different *role functions*. These are about different functions that in a traditional theatre are taken by different persons, such as for example dramaturge, scenographer, actor, and director (O'Toole, 1992). The group process, or said in other terms, ensemble-building, is then emphasized, and this involves all participants' equal value in the work and the democratic process (Neelands, 2009), and on "relationships of trust" (Nicolson, 2002, p. 83). Trust can be continually enacted in the social interplay. This process of ensemble-building is here seen as ongoing during the collaboration with a drama activity. Hence, participants' *engagement* in the doing can be manifested as interior affects and understanding, *and* as exterior expression in dramatic acting (Bundy, 2003; Gallagher, 2000).

The working process in drama can be described as a *devising process*. *Devising* can be understood in slightly different ways within the drama/theatre field, for example depending if there exists a given frame prior to the working process or not (Oddey, 1994). It is here defined as "production strategies where the [...] ensemble explore a material or pretext, and create new material based on the point of departure" (Mjaaland Heggstad, Eriksson & Rasmussen, 2013, p. 15). In a devising process, different components, such as for example the text, the participants and the physical space and objects, are considered as co-producing agents. Participants can explore and integrate their experiences and perceptions in the collective creation (Oddey, 1994). The process of creation can include both planning together and improvisation. *Improvisation* is about the making of an immediate understanding or judgement without conscious reasoning. It can also be understood as a spontaneous response to situations and others' actions (Courtney, 1990; Johnstone, 1979; Sawyer, 2011; Spolin, 1963/1983). It is also about to be open for others' and our own suggestions (Johnstone, 1979).

³² These ideas about *ensemble* are influenced by for example group theatres, and Brecht and the organizational structure of Berliner Ensemble. (Britton, J. (Ed.) (2013). *Encountering Ensemble*. London, New Dehli, New York and Sydney: Bloomsbury.) Thereby the term *ensemble* is connected to political ideas about democracy and everyone's equal value.

In this initial presentation of central drama terms, references have been made to drama theory, and in the analysis of data, in part III, these concepts will be discussed with references to other complementary theories used in the thesis.

1.5 Disposition of the thesis

This thesis contains three parts. In the first part, I introduce and contextualize the research questions for this study. It starts with a presentation of the research questions and the background for them. This is connected to a summarized overview of previous research about learning in drama, and with a discussion about what knowledge this study aims to contribute with. This is followed by a description of how drama is defined in the present study. In **chapter 2**, the current situation for drama in the compulsory school system in Sweden is discussed. This is done through a genealogical analysis of which discourses over time concerning education and drama have contributed to how it is today. In the beginning of this chapter, I provide a description of the concept of *discourse* and how it is defined by Foucault, and about genealogy as an analytic tool. However, this is an included part of the Post-constructionist approach used in this study, and this implies that the description of methodology is divided. The discussion about discursive formations continues in chapter 3, and I there make a connection to the overall methodological approach.

The reason for doing so is that chapter 2 provides a background for the current situation for drama in Swedish compulsory schooling and therefore it is also a background for this research study. The methodological approach for the present research study involves ongoing moves between different sites, as a process where I as researcher am working with different parts in parallel. This also implies that the writing of the text is not done in a linear order. The writing is seen as part of the creation of knowledge, and as Braidotti (2013, p. 166) says: “Thinking and writing, like breathing, are not held in the mold of linearity [...], but move outwards, out of bonds, in webs of encounters with, ideas, others, texts”. The text thereafter is organized in the present form, and throughout the text, I refer back to previous sections and forward to subsequent sections.

The second part of the thesis focuses on the methodological approach in the thesis. Post-constructionism is used as a theoretical tool, and in **chapter 3**, I provide a description of this and how it is applied here. This is related to a discussion about the concept of learning. **Chapter 4** deals with the empirical study that I have undertaken. The participating schools in the study are presented, the methods of constructing and analyzing data, and ethical considerations are described.

In the third part, I analyze the data produced in the empirical study. The analysis of constructed data is presented interconnected with a discussion related to theoretical reasoning. I move between the different local practices of drama education. When the discussion concerns educational practices on national level, I refer back to back the genealogical analysis. **Chapter 5** is about organizational conditions for drama education on a local level. It includes formulated purposes, and provided space and time for drama as a scheduled subject. This is connected to a discussion of pupils' expressed perceptions and experiences of drama and learning in drama. **Chapter 6 and 7**, deal with the analysis of which learning processes are made possible and manifest in concrete drama educational practices. The components standing out as significant for learning in drama are dramatic acting in role, improvisation and collective creation. In the analysis, a focus lies on how these components contribute to learning. In chapter 6, emphasis is on dramatic acting in role while chapter 7 has emphasis on improvisation within drama education. **Chapter 8** contains a summarized discussion of what drama can be within compulsory school education and how learning takes place in and through drama. A focus is on how different components in drama educational practices are interconnected, and how macro- and micro-level of politic impact on this, and can be seen as interrelated. Throughout the chapter, conclusions drawn from this research study are presented. Finally, I consider implications for drama education in Sweden. In this chapter, a discussion about chosen methodology is also provided.

2. Drama in the compulsory school system in Sweden

This chapter provides a background about the use of drama in compulsory school education in Sweden. Pedagogical and aesthetic trends, and dominant school policy have contributed to drama educational practices and to the current situation for drama in the school system, and a historical retrospective concerning this is presented here.

The development of drama and its place within formal education has been influenced by various contextual factors, including national education policy, school policy, dominant pedagogical trends and views on aesthetics. In Sweden, aspects of social and personal development have been prominent within the drama field (Elsner, 2000; Rasmusson, 2000) for many years, and this includes approaches to drama within educational settings in schools. Drama has been mentioned in national curricula for Swedish compulsory schools since *Läroplan för grundskolan 1962* (Lgr 62, in English titled “Curriculum for compulsory school 1962”). Curricula are products of political agreements concerning the purpose and organization of education, and dominant views and values concerning education are reflected in these. Curricula and other policy documents are included in the framework that regulates what is possible in educational practices. The intention in this chapter is to study what has been mentioned about drama in various policy documents and which aspects of drama are visible in the current curriculum (*Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmen*, Lgr 11/17). Other kinds of sources are also relevant for identifying new emerging perspectives concerning drama’s position in Swedish compulsory schools. Drama practitioners might emphasize certain forms of drama and contribute to the fact that some approaches dominate within specific drama practices. Different pedagogical and aesthetic trends have influenced drama practices and how drama is taught today in school. What changes over time may have contributed to how it is today? Which ways to define and to use drama in relation to schooling have contributed to this? How is the development of drama interconnected with the development of the compulsory school? A historical retrospective might serve as a help to capture different factors that influence, and have influenced what drama practice in Swedish schools looks like and so provide the context for the research in this thesis.

In other words, I undertake in this chapter a brief historical retrospective in order to analyze the current situation and highlight new emerging perspectives. The process of change is not seen here as a given development that can be explained by underlying regularities. Instead of identifying linear relationships, the focus is placed on discontinuities and ruptures. This approach is inspired by Foucault and his genealogical approach. According to Foucault's (1969/1972) conceptualization of genealogy, processes are not necessarily linear and continuously moving in a given direction. This approach involves the view that changes cannot be described as development, since the concept of *development* indicates a given direction in which there is something intrinsic that gradually unfolds. The expression 'development of drama' can be interpreted as though there is a predetermined direction in which changes of practice of drama in school are moving. As Foucault (1969/1972, p. 173) argues, changes may instead occur as "continuity, return, and repetition". My choice of approach implies a shift in the way to look at and describe changes in that emphasis will be placed on discontinuities and moments of rupture.

2. 1 Genealogy as a tool for analysis

Genealogy can be described as the study of the forming of discourses (Foucault, 1971/1981). Discourses are not formed by a given, inevitable causality, but are dependent on coincidences and discontinuities. The concept of 'discourse' has been defined in different ways, but for the purpose of this discussion, I work with the definition as ways to talk about something and include what it is possible to do and say (Foucault, 1969/1972)³³, (see also p. 6 in this thesis). This implies that discourses

³³ In his later works, Foucault introduced the concept *dispositif*, a concept that includes both discursive and non-discursive elements. This concept is defined as the interplay between discursive and non-discursive elements (Foucault, 1980). Non-discursive elements are "institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions" (Foucault, 1980, p. 194). In the present chapter, written sources are analyzed and non-discursive elements described verbally. This implies that they constitute parts of discursive utterances. The reasoning here is limited to comprise discourses since I, in line with Foucault, do not consider it important to distinguish "that this is discursive and that isn't" (Foucault, 1980, p. 198). Foucault's reasoning about discursive and non-discursive elements is highlighted by Deleuze (Deleuze, G. (1988/1990). *Foucault*. Stockholm: Symposium Bokförlag.). The concept *dispositif*, and Deleuze's discussion will prove be useful in chapter 3 in this thesis, about theoretical approaches to learning.

govern what it is possible to think and do in specific contexts. Therefore, discourses are related to power.

Power relations permeate society at all levels. Foucault (1975/1991) describes power as a relational concept and says that it can be seen in terms of excluding and including processes. Power regulates what counts as truth and “forms knowledge” (Foucault, 1980, p. 119), and at the same time power produces knowledge.

Knowledge does not exist ‘out there’ as something neutral. This inseparable interrelation between power and knowledge is visualized by the concept *power-knowledge* (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009). A discourse constitutes a practice that governs what is regarded as knowledge, involving mechanisms that at a particular time allow certain discourses, which is described as a *régime of truth* (Foucault, 1975/1991, 1980). This implies that conceptions about a phenomenon are created discursively as historically spaced practices (Foucault, 1969/1972) and are thereby affected by various contextually defined social and political factors. Depending on factors included in an analysis, different histories can be told. Thus, historiography can imply the exposition of “several pasts, several forms of connexion, several hierarchies of importance, several networks of determination [...]” (Foucault, 1969/1972, p. 5).

Genealogy is conceptualized in the present work as a tool for analysis, a point of departure for analysis is to trace moments of disruption (Foucault, 1991). Such moments are here called *significant moments* (Garratt, Piper and Taylor, 2013, p. 616). A series of moments of discontinuity constitute displacements and transformation of discourses (Foucault, 1969/1972, 1991). The analysis also includes the identification of interrelated factors and of interplays between these. Discourses are constantly in a state of flux. Different forces pull in different directions, and thereby several discourses can be active. One and same discourse can be an instrument for or an obstacle to power (Foucault, 1976/1990). It is therefore necessary to identify where in the power field a certain discourse is positioned at a certain moment.

Discourses must be treated as discontinuous practices, which cross each other, are sometimes juxtaposed with one another, but can just as well exclude or be unaware of each other. (Foucault, 1971/1981, p. 67).

As part of the analysis process, I will highlight some different and interrelating components that form a practice. These relations are not static, and not all components 'enter the scene' simultaneously, or in other words, changes following a disruption emerge successively. I will describe when significant components are put into operation, and how they are interrelated and active in continuous changes of discursive practice relating to drama in Swedish schooling. I am aware that regardless of my efforts there is always the risk that I will fall in to the trap of writing a narrative, but alert the reader to this possibility from the outset.

From this theoretical stance, it is not possible to reveal one given truth about a phenomenon: hence, the intention in this chapter is to contribute to making visible the current position of drama in the Swedish compulsory school. 'Positioning' is here defined as how someone positions herself/himself or is placed in a specific location in relation to an identified discourse, and how certain positions are made possible in that discourse. This is an analysis about a phenomenon, and is concerned with how a position taken relates to a particular discourse or set of discourses. Whilst discourses about drama education in schooling have been influenced by approaches to drama among drama practitioners in Sweden and by current pedagogical and aesthetic perspectives within the educational sector, the focus here is on how drama is and has been positioned by drama practitioners, on the one hand, and by policy makers in the educational sector, on the other hand. Relations that form a discourse "are established between institutions, economic and social processes, behavioral patterns, systems of norms, techniques, types of classification, modes of characterization... They do not define its [an object of discourse] internal constitution, but what enables it to appear..." (Foucault, 1969/1972, p. 45). As mentioned above, discourses can be described as practices, and the focus for this analysis lies on practices of drama as artistic expression and as a way to investigate and learn about different topics within the compulsory school system in Sweden. My ambition is to trace significant

moments within the field of drama and of education and which have been of crucial importance for how drama is currently practised in school.³⁴

Here the term *drama* is used and I have earlier provided a motivation why I do so (see the definition of drama provided in section 1.3). However, various names of the phenomenon have been used in different sources, for example *dramatics*, *pedagogical drama* and *theatre*. What does the naming do? In line with Foucault's reasoning that the meaning of an expression depends on the situation in which it is used (Foucault, 1969/1972) naming can thus be seen as discursively constructed. The meaning of a word does not exist as a given truth beyond discourses, it is constructed through unexpressed rules, assumptions, norms, et cetera that are established in a particular context. Naming directs our attention in a particular direction. Our attention is directed towards aspects that are considered as characteristic for a phenomenon. This implies that definitions of what a phenomenon is indirectly also tell what it is not, what is excluded. Foucault (1969/1972, p. 49) argues that in an analysis of discourses "one sees the loosening of the embrace, apparently so tight, of words and things, and the emergence of a group of rules proper to discursive practice". Therefore, naming will continuously be considered in discussion in this chapter.

As has been mentioned earlier (p. 28), drama-theatre³⁵ and play share many of the same roots. Conceptions about what play and aesthetic activities are, and are given possibilities to be, are governed by dominating discourses. This also applies to the relation between play, aesthetic expressions and education. What is seen as important, beneficial and useful or not in education varies depending on prevailing conceptions about fosterage and its role in education. School education always has an intentionality and is connected to ideological ideas (see for example Edling, 2012). The term *fosterage* refers to socialization into prevailing norms and values, who the subject can be and become within a particular society and the qualities desired the subject develop in order to contribute to the society's further development (see

³⁴ In this analysis, some drama pioneers are included, but I am aware that others have also had an influence on practices of drama in Sweden. The ones who are included have been mentioned recurrently in drama literature in connection to the issues here discussed.

³⁵ Here, the concepts drama and theatre are interconnected with a hyphen, which illustrates that there is no given limit between them.

Biesta, 2011; Edling, 2012). As I mentioned in section 1.2.1, the Swedish school has a mission to foster and provide knowledge. Since the imposition of compulsory schooling in 1842, this double mission has constituted the base for schooling (Hartman, 2005). Dominating discourses about fosterage and knowledge and the interplay between these have an impact on which approaches to drama have been given space within schooling.

This study focuses on the compulsory school system, and thereby on education directed to children of school age. Conceptions about what a child is and needs are socially and cultural constructed. Childhood discourses in the Swedish context are related to school policy, or in other words what is considered as good education for whom. Ideas about childhood and the realization of education are interconnected as practice, and are related to discourses about fosterage and knowledge. Also, in the drama field, conceptions about the child have influenced practices of drama.

Practices are described by Foucault (1991, p. 75) as “places where what is said and what is done, rules imposed and reasons given, the planned and the taken for granted meet and interconnect”. My analysis has a focus on drama as part of education in compulsory school, which implies a place where discourses about aesthetic activity, fosterage, knowledge and childhood meet.³⁶

2. 2 Drama as practice in relation to fosterage and knowledge

In the following, I make a jump back in time to the period before the imposition of compulsory education in Sweden, and from there and onwards trace disruptions and changes that have contributed to today’s practice regarding drama in education.

2.2.1 School theatre, play, and the birth of childhood

Hagnell (1983) suggests that before the 1800s there was no division between theatre for children and theatre for adults. Neither was playing something just for children

³⁶ As mentioned earlier, the ambition for this genealogical analysis is to trace significant moments. This differs from a chronological overview that might provide an overall historical description. In the present analysis, all curricula for the Swedish compulsory school are not included. Neither are all drama pioneers of importance for drama in Sweden mentioned, only those with significant influence for drama practices in Swedish compulsory school.

(Hagnell, 1983; Øksnes, 2010). Different forms of pranks, jokes, games and play were used as breaks during work and as relaxation. The children were involved in the working community in the social class they were born into, and took part in work. Childhood was not seen as a period separated from adult life. Both children and adults participated in play and games, and looked at spectacles together.

They argue that the spread of Protestantism in Europe in the 1500s contributed to play and work being separated. Work was considered as important and beneficial while play was seen as non-serious. Play was considered as good only if it was assumed to benefit the capability to work. Some sorts of play were seen as harmful, and play was therefore something that had to be limited and controlled. This especially concerned loud and carnivalesque play. The concept of carnivalesque play is taken from Øksnes (2010). This is characterized by nonsense, laugh, burlesque expressions, and by making fun of those in official power. Øksnes uses Bakhtin's (1984) description of carnival. Bakhtin relates carnival to folk culture, to a laughter culture where there is no division between participants and spectators. There is a parallel between carnival and buffoonery. An old Swedish word for buffoon is "lekare" (*Nationalencyklopedin*, 1993) which means "player". Thus, it can be said that there was no clear distinction between folk theatre and play. Theatre as entertainment was considered to have bad influence on morals, if the content did not have an edifying character. Only content that was considered to contribute to a virtuous and godly life was seen as edifying (Hagnell, 1983; Lindvåg, 1988). However, theatre seems to have had limited spread in Sweden, compared with many other countries in Europe (Brockett, 1982). But there are sources showing that theatre was used as part of education in Sweden from the Middle Ages and onward.

Dramatizations were used as a way to teach biblical stories and the Christian message. In education, dramatizations were used as a tool for moral and Christian fosterage (Hägglund, 2001). The Swedish Bishop Jesper Swedberg (1653-1735) said that "comoedier" visserligen är olämpliga, om de är hedniska och lättfärdiga, men att ungdomen "kan hafwa sin ro och goda vpbyggelse" av teater, om den utnyttjas rätt" (Lindvåg, 1988, p. 65) (This source is written in an older form of Swedish and the quotation is difficult to translate literally to English. Therefore, it is written as the original text in Swedish, and an explanation of the signification in English is

approximately: "comedies" are inappropriate if they are pagan and scabrous, but that youths "can have calm and edification" by theatre, if it is used properly.")

However, school theatre was available for very few. Formal education was offered only to boys, and was organized by the Church and as private education within the aristocracy (Hartman, 2005). There was a division both by gender and by social class. Some work tasks were considered suitable for girls while others were suitable only for boys. Public works was accessible only to men from the higher social classes. Education aimed to ensure regrowth into ecclesiastical and administrative tasks. The Church had great influence, and regulated the lives of people with various laws and regulations and this included folk education. In the 1686 years' Church law, it was stated that all housefathers were obliged to offer education. This obligation of home teaching involved reading and Luther's *Catechism*, and was controlled by the Church's officers. Knowledge about Gods's Word was a prerequisite for Confirmation, and this in turn was a prerequisite to be considered as an adult. Folk education was aimed to foster godliness, virtue and obedience.

The Church's laws and regulations governed to large extent what was considered as appropriate living and behavior. Behavior was regulated by regulations and punishment. It was a patriarchal hierarchy where men had positions of power in the Church, society and family. Childhood was not considered a delimited period but as a gradual maturation and preparation for being a complete human. An idea about *the evil child* prevailed at this time, based on the idea the child was born with original sin. Children had to be trained and disciplined. Irrational behavior and obstinacy had to be punished. (Helander, 2014.)

The transition from agrarian society to industrial society in the 1800s saw the emergence of a new narrative view of children, and thus also the view of the role of education. Industrialization meant that many without their own land came to the cities and worked in factories. Paid work and private life became separated parts of life, and children were working in industries. Children were considered as economically valuable. Gradually this narrative was challenged by the argument that child labor destroyed both the body and soul of the children. Industrial society also led to new demands on educated manpower. The dominant narrative of children began to be challenged by the view that childhood was a distinct period and

qualitative different than adulthood. The philosophe Jean-Jacques Rousseau's (1712-1789) thoughts about the free and natural child had increased influence.

Simultaneously, there prevailed an idea about the child as vulnerable. Children were seen as innocent and fragile plants, and in need of nurture in the home and of education in school. These ideas about childhood contributed to changed attitudes regarding child labor. "The children had to be rescued from the obligation to be useful" (Sandin, 1995, p. 1). Child labor was prohibited by law, and compulsory schooling was imposed in 1842.

The changing and competing views about childhood were related to changes in the organization of education and conceptions about whom formal schooling was for. The state took over formal responsibility for compulsory school, which meant that the Church's power declined. The state decided that education should include both fosterage and teaching for knowledge. The commission of fosterage was prominent and included moral upbringing, orderliness and reverence for authority (Edling, 2012; Svalfors, 1996). The aim of schooling was thus very much about the reproduction of values and knowledge. Hence, another idea about childhood becomes visible: the child as subordinated and as receiver of values and knowledge.

The different ideas about childhood highlighted above are related to each other within a discursive field. As Foucault (1969/1972, p. 46) describes it, they are "in a sense, at the limit of discourse. Discourses about childhood can be described as "interplays of differences, distances, substitutions and transformations" (ibid., p. 37). The birth of childhood as category is not about one distinct way of being, but about various and changeable ideas. Child discourses are also interrelated with other categories such as social class and gender, which meant that the duration and content of education varied between different social classes, and between boys and girls. During this period, different school forms emerged. The higher social strata did not want to put their children in the same schools as the less well-off children, which led to the founding of private schools. It was not until the revised School Act of 1882 that compulsory school attendance was implemented. From then on education also included girls. (Hartman, 2005; Sandin, 1995; Svalfors, 1996.) Changed conditions made it necessary for women to support themselves and new laws gave different possibilities for this. The teaching profession now also included women. These

factors contributed to an increased number of girl's schools. The revised School Act of 1882, together with new pedagogical trends in girls' schools, contributed to a change of how drama was practised in education. Thereby, the revised School Act of 1882 implied a significant change of conditions for drama within formal education in Sweden. In line with Foucault's (1969/1972) reasoning, this implies a change of conditions for drama as a discursive practice.

Thus, the revised School Act of 1882 constituted a significant moment of change of practice concerning conditions for drama as a part of compulsory school in Sweden, and in the following section, some pivotal discursive changes will be highlighted.

2.2.2 Children's theatre, arts as fosterage and reform pedagogy

This change described above is interrelated with a spread of literature and theatre for children. From the late 1800s, stories and dramatic plays were written directly for children. The purpose was to foster godliness and decency. But the religious component slowly decreased and the emphasis shifted towards honesty and humility. Experiences of theatre, literature and poetry and other art forms were considered to support ethical fosterage. A great deal of the written dramatic works were intended to be performed by children, at home and in school (Helander, 2014). Aesthetic activities were considered to support both good taste and ethical fosterage. Such thought was expressed by Ellen Key³⁷ (1900/1995, p. 68): "A sound development of the imagination has not only an aesthetic but ethical importance. It is a basic condition for an effective sympathy."³⁸

Ellen Key argued for an education based on the individual child's needs and interests. Influences from Rousseau (1762/1977) can be seen here in that the focus lay on the individual child and freedom considered as a prerequisite for development. It was important not to interfere but to allow the child to freely explore the world. In this narrative, the child was considered to have an innate creativity and an innate

³⁷ Ellen Key (1849 - 1926) was a Swedish writer, educator, and strongly engaged in issues of freedom of expression and freedom of the press, women's rights, education and social issues. Her most famous book *Child Century* was published 1900, and then translated into several languages.

³⁸ ["En sund utveckling av fantasien har ej endast en estetisk men en etisk betydelse. Detta är ett grundvillkor för en verksam sympati." (Key, 1900/1995, p. 68.)]

driving force to play. Rousseau highlighted play as children's natural form of learning. The child should be given possibilities to find her or his own answers through self-activity. This narrative inspired many pedagogues within the reform pedagogical movement.

Reform pedagogy is a collective name for reforms of goals and working practices within education which evolved in Sweden and in many countries in Europe from the late 1800s. This challenged the dominating positivist approach, according to which knowledge was regarded as objective and verifiable. Reform pedagogues emphasized pupils' participation, community connection, play and creative activity, and an explorative and interdisciplinary approach. The approach was based on the idea about the individual child's rights and about the need for a harmonious development of the whole personality. Beside Rousseau, John Dewey's thoughts also had a great influence on Swedish reform pedagogy³⁹. Reform pedagogy that developed in Europe has parallels with the progressive education that developed in the USA. Common to them all is the view of the individual as active and participating in the development of community and a focus on empirical experiences (Gustavsson, 2000).⁴⁰ These ideas have been spread primarily through Dewey's works. Already in 1900, he argued for an education based on pupils' active investigation, collaboration and communication. He meant that school constitutes an "organic whole" (Dewey, 1900, p. 106) and that an experience has "its geographical aspect, its artistic and its literally, its scientific and its historical sides" (ibid., p. 106). The child was seen as active and curious, and education was about introducing activities based on the child's interest, to give it direction and possibilities to reflect upon the doing.⁴¹ Development was seen as growing. The main purpose for education was to contribute to children's growing and make them capable to live in the democratic society.

³⁹ Of course, there were also others who influenced reform pedagogy, but only these two are mentioned here because they have had an influence on approaches to aesthetic activities in education and have been referred to in much Swedish drama literature.

⁴⁰ The concepts of reform pedagogy and progressivism have been mentioned here. Different sources use either 'reform pedagogy' or 'progressivism'. In texts about the historical period when the reform pedagogic movement was flourishing in Europe, 'reform pedagogy' is used, but that in texts concerning trends after this period 'progressivism' is used. In Swedish literature about drama are connections with reform pedagogy highlighted but not with progressivism. Progressivism has undergone changes over time (Carlgren, 2011, Gustavsson, 2002). This might be a reason why drama practitioners refer to reform pedagogy.

⁴¹ Dewey's thoughts will be described more profoundly in section 3.1.1.

These humanistic ideals initially got a foothold within girls' schools in Sweden. Their education was directed more towards practical and humanistic subjects than the education for boys was. Many of the girls' schools were private, and the content and organization of their education not so strictly regulated as the boys' schools. As Hägglund (2001, p. 38)⁴². says, it gave the "time and possibilities to experiment with new methods for education and new features on the schedule". But the private schools were not for free which excluded girls from the lower strata of society. So, even if the school was compulsory for all children, there were great differences depending on class and gender.⁴³

In the girls' schools, there was a striving for new forms of education adapted to prevailing reform pedagogical ideas about the child and to how the child learns. Influences came from international networks within the reform pedagogic movement. Play and school theatre were given space within education. The forms for how they were used expanded and this implies that drama primarily was used within girls' schools (Hägglund, 2001; Rasmusson, 2000). Hägglund (2001) has in his research focused especially on one girls' school, *Tyringe Helpension*, and gives examples of how drama was used in education there in various school subjects and that the pupils produced their own theatre performances. According to this case, there was a focus both on learning about subject-related content, on art form and on personal and social development. Other descriptions indicate that various forms of drama – play – theatre were used in schools (Hagnell, 1983; Hägglund, 2001; Rasmusson, 2000). It seems that these forms were used as way to develop knowledge within different subject fields and as social fosterage. The underlying values for reform pedagogy entailed that subject knowledge and both arts fosterage and social fosterage were interwoven, both as idea and as educational practice of knowing through experiential activity. Concerning arts fosterage, it seems that there was a focus on fosterage *through* arts. The sources do not describe education in for example different theatre genres. The purpose and use of drama in education seems to have been an interacting part in the educational space, as theatre - play. Theatre –

⁴² ["...tid och möjlighet att experimentera med nya undervisningsmetoder och nya inslag på schemat" (Hägglund, 2001, p. 38).]

⁴³ With the implementation of one united school for all children, followed more regulated conditions for all education and this I will highlight later in this chapter.

play is written as a continuum since theatre performances, pantomime, tableaux, short dramatizations and playing have been mentioned (Hägglund, 2001).

Social fosterage was aimed for individual responsibility for one's own actions, and to consider all individuals as unique and having the same value. There was a focus on the development of an individual's interior resources, as social responsibility was supposed to start as an interior understanding. This approach can also be related to changes within the theatre field internationally, which indicates that changes of drama practice in schools, took place as a play of interactions and tensions between forces in a discursive formation (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009).

I now highlight an approach to theatre which emerged in the turn of the 1900s and which had significant importance for changes of drama practice in Swedish schools. In the early 1900s, the naturalist approach to theatre began to spread in many Western countries. According to this, a dramatic work should "be true in that it is credible in the preparation and presentation, that is, not stylized or idealized. The spectator should have the opportunity to empathize with the dramatic fiction being played." ⁴⁴ (Pusztai, 2000, p. 41.) This trend met ideas about organic development and a holistic approach to development, which included the individual's senses, mind and emotions. Constantin Stanislavskij (1863-1938), the Russian theatre worker whose ideas have had a major impact on Western theatre, was influenced by these thoughts. Stanislavskij (1936/1989) created a system of acting training that was based on a gradual development, from an "interior work with one self" with exercises and improvisation, followed by an exterior characterization of role where interior emotions and experiences make it possible "to live the role". Stanislavskij highlighted the imagination as a tool for being in a fictive situation. The aesthetic creation starts with an *as-if*, which implies to imagine given circumstances or conditions for a fictive situation and to act in role as-if it is real. The use of as-if has similarities with children's dramatic plays (Pusztai, 2000).

⁴⁴ ["(...) vara sant i det att det är trovärdigt i framställning och framförande, d v s inte stiliserat eller idealiserat. Åskådaren ska få möjlighet att leva sig in i den dramatiska fiktion som spelas." (Pusztai, 2000, p. 41.)]

This approach to theatre influenced both theatre as a leisure time activity for children and as a practice of drama in school. Winifred Ward (1884-1975), an American pedagogue, was inspired by Stanislavskij as well as by Rousseau and Dewey, in her educational work in drama. Then prevailing ideas about the individual's development as growing in a desired direction are visible in Ward's writing about drama. She argues that:

The whole child must be developed if he is to reach his maximum growth.
(...) his capacity of creative self-expression should be developed, and at the same time he should grow in tolerant understanding of self and society.
(Ward, 1930, p. 2)

Ward used the term *creative dramatics* to distinguish drama from traditional theatre where children had to memorize lines. *Creative dramatics* can be described as a gradual process, from exercises aimed to create a safe group climate and to stimulate imagination and concentration, and thereafter work with dramatizations in role (Rasmusson, 2000).

Ward's work inspired reform pedagogues and one of them was Elsa Olenius (1896-1984), who brought *creative dramatics* to Sweden. She was a librarian and started children's theatre activities named *Vår teater*, a voluntary leisure time activity. She used Creative dramatics, and a central aim was to release imagination and creativity, and to work together in a project with theatre performance as final goal. Olenius was engaged also as drama teacher in a girl school in Stockholm, *Sofia flickskola*, where she adapted the form of work to education (Rasmusson, 2000; Sternudd, 2000). According to descriptions of Creative dramatics as education in school, the focus was on drama as a method for the emancipation of individuals' means of expression and creativity, for social development and for experiential learning in different subjects (Lindvåg, 1988; Rasmusson, 2000; Sternudd, 2000). Creative dramatics was also considered as a preparation for work with theatre. Olenius expressed it in the following way: "Creative dramatics is a preparation and a complement to children's theatre." (Olenius, 1965, p. 2, quoted in Rasmusson, 2000, p.84.)⁴⁵

⁴⁵ ["creative dramatics är en förberedelse och ett komplement till barnteater." (Olenius, 1965, p. 2, quoted in Rasmusson, 2000.)]

Influences emerged both from the above mentioned approach to theatre and from reform pedagogy, in the practice of drama in school in Sweden. Seemingly, there was no clear distinction between fosterage and teaching for knowledge when drama was used. However, as mentioned earlier, different school forms existed in Sweden during the first part of the 1900s: there was a parallel school system (in Swedish is it termed *parallellskolesystem*). There was a difference between school forms depending on gender and social class. Different forms of teaching were practised in different schools. Drama was used in education in some schools, but far from in all and mostly in girls' schools.

The reform pedagogical movement and the emergence of girls' schools have had significant importance for practice of drama in Swedish compulsory school.

2.2.3 Democratic fosterage and a united school system

The time after the Second World War implied major changes in the educational system in Sweden and produced changed conditions for the practice of drama in school.

After the Second World War, the school's hierarchical structure was questioned. It was argued that the World Wars had been made possible because people had been fostered for unquestioning obedience. Therefore, democracy, pluralism and all humans' equal value were emphasized (Gustavsson, 2002; Sternudd, 2000). In the School Commission's report 1946 (SOU 1948:27), it was stated that the most important thing for school was to foster critical and active democratic citizens and that school had to be reformed in accordance with a democratic society's structure and life.

However, the main purpose for the School Commission was to formulate proposals on guidelines for the development of a united 9-year compulsory school for all children. The report included proposals concerning both forms and content for education. In the proposal, influences from progressivism were evident. There was an emphasis on pupils own activity and on subject integration. Education should include both theoretical and practical parts, with for example laboratory methods and activity pedagogy. Aesthetic fosterage was considered as important for development of good taste, for ethical reasons and with the purpose to stimulate an interest in cultural activities in leisure time. Cultural activities were considered as useful for

social fosterage, as for example collaborative work with theatre performance (SOU 1948:27, p. 32).

The implementation of a united compulsory school for all children was preceded by twenty years of investigations and experimental schools. The purpose of these experimental activities was to elaborate forms of education where the individual, active pupil was the focus (Hartman, 2005). A prerequisite for this was that teachers had great freedom. This was also highlighted in the School Commission's report: "Teachers need freedom in order to adapt the work to children's needs, to feel joy in work, and in order to have possibility to contribute to the educational development through their own creativity" (SOU 1948: 27, p. 84)⁴⁶. This implied possibilities for schools and teachers to try out different ways to organize and perform education. One example of experimental activities that took place in schools was *activity pedagogy*, e.g. the drama education in *Sofia flickskola* that is mentioned above. This school was the first school in the Nordic countries to have drama scheduled as a subject and has been an inspiration for several drama practitioners (Rasmusson, 2000), and also for formulations about drama in the first curriculum for Swedish compulsory school, Lgr 62, (Sternudd, 2000).

Beside the writings about Creative dramatics and the theatre activity *Vår teater*, researchers with a focus on the history of drama and on drama education in Sweden have not written about how drama was used during the period from the time after the Second World War and up to the 1960s. Hägglund (2008) argues that the period from the 1950s to 1960s need to be researched regarding drama in Sweden.

During this period of experimentation, a drama discourse was formed which has influenced how drama has been practiced in Sweden until today. The reform pedagogical approach, with participation, collaboration, experiential learning through explorative activity and the focus on both individual and social development, still characterizes the practice of drama (Hägglund, 2001; Sternudd, 2000). A democratic approach has become a significant point of departure for drama as a field. However, there has been a varied focus on theatrical expression and drama as a method,

⁴⁶"Lärarna har behov av frihet för att kunna anpassa arbetet efter barnen, för att känna arbetsglädje och för att ha möjlighet att bidra till den pedagogiska utvecklingen genom eget nyskapande (SOU 1948: 27, p. 84).]

depending on where in the power play the drama discourse is located in a certain situation. As mentioned earlier, a discursive formation is never stable (Foucault, 1969/1972).

2.2.4 Developmental psychology and drama as method

After the mid-1900s, dominating discourses about what is counted as important in schooling have contributed to a more marginalized position for drama in school.

From 1962, Sweden has had a common school form for all children, a 9 years compulsory school. This implied a shift regarding the educational system. The first curriculum for compulsory school, Lgr 62 (*Läroplan för grundskolan 1962*) formulations from the School Commission's report 1946, that the most important thing for school was to foster critical and active democratic citizens, had been reduced to more vague formulations about personal development, social fosterage and adaptation “[...] in the society of today and tomorrow” (Lgr 62, p. 15)⁴⁷. At this time, democracy and the idea of equal value begun to be considered as given and as existing independent of every person’s daily actions (Edling, 2012). The shift began towards an increased rationalization and technological development in society. This led to an increased demand for skilled labor, and the main purpose for school was to support market needs. In order to provide knowledge for all pupils in the united school and to meet pupils’ different prerequisites to study, school education was individualized. Individualization was also a way to attain differentiation (Carlgren, Klette, Mýrdal, Schnack & Simola, 2006). Lgr 62 contained detailed presentations of content in the different school subjects. The pupils should be “treated and instructed or taught as individuals to an existing body of knowledge” (Carlgren et. al., 2006, p. 304). It was stated in the curriculum, that “[in] the center for the school's fostering activities is the individual pupil” (Lgr 62, p. 13)⁴⁸. School should provide “fostering for work” (Svalfors, 1996, p. 28). The curriculum Lgr 62 produced a changed practice of education and of how the child was seen. A dominating child discourse was the child as becoming, but not yet being a responsible citizen in the future, adapted to society’s demands.

⁴⁷ [”(...) i dagens och morgondagens samhälle” (Lgr 62, p. 15).]

⁴⁸ [”I centrum för skolans fostrande verksamhet står den enskilda eleven” (Lgr 62, p. 13)]

In Lgr 62, focus was on traditional forms of teaching. It was recommended to use both individual work and whole class teaching. Drama was considered as an activity, to be included in all subjects, and especially within the subject of Swedish. Drama was described as an activity “[...] with the purpose to support children’s and youth’s creativity, language development as a way to incarnate literature and content in different subjects” (Sternudd, 2000, p. 168)⁴⁹. This indicates that reform pedagogical ideas permeated the way drama was included in the curriculum but with a displacement towards being unilaterally an instrumental method. This displacement was reflected in that the terms *dramatic* and *dramatic presentation* (in Swedish: *dramatisk framställning*) were used. *Dramatic presentation* was used as a term instead of *theatre*, which is visible in the explanation of dramatic presentation: “improvisation, reading with distributed roles, performance of simple plays and scenes from plays [...]” (Lgr 62, p. 127)⁵⁰.

A curriculum does not define what drama is, but produces conditions for what is possible to do within the prevailing educational context. The detailed injunctions concerning subject content conceded limited freedom for teachers.⁵¹ From the implementation of Lgr 62, drama has had a weak position within policy for Swedish compulsory school. One reason was the confirmation of traditional education and increased individualization manifested in the curriculum.

In the Swedish educational field, there was from the late 1960s an increased interest in the development of quality in education, which implied an interest in developmental psychology. A prerequisite to meet the pupils’ individual needs was that teachers had knowledge about “(...) children’s normal development and the most common causes of incorrect behavior, so that he can help to prevent and rescind existing adjustment difficulties and create psychologically proper conditions for activities within school” (Lgr 62, p. 17)⁵². This led to an interest in development

⁴⁹ “[...]med syfte att stödja barns och ungdomars kreativitet, språkliga utveckling och som ett sätt att levandegöra litteratur och innehåll i olika ämnen.” (Sternudd, 2000, p. 168).]

⁵⁰ [improvisationer, läsning med fördelade roller, framförande av enkla pjäser och scener ur skådespel [...]” (Lgr 62, p. 127)]

⁵¹ What it is possible to do also depends on educational possibilities for teachers. Teachers with an interest in drama have mostly had to attend courses outside teacher training programs, and this is the situation also when this text is written. However, issues about teachers’ education are not discussed in this thesis.

⁵² “[...] barns normala utvecklingsgång och de vanligaste grundorsakerna till felaktigt beteende, så att han kan hindra och häva förekommande anpassningssvårigheter och skapa psykologiskt riktiga förutsättningar för verksamheten inom skolans väggar.” (Lgr 62, p. 17).]

psychology, which is a common term for different theories concerning individual's psychological development, especially where cognitive, emotional and social development are in focus (Askland & Sataoen, 2014). Each theory focused on one particular aspect and there was an interest especially concerning children's and youths' development. What was common for developmental theories is the view that development takes place in different stages and that these stages follow each other in a predetermined order.

For example, Jean Piaget's (1982) theory about cognitive development was prominent within Swedish education for a long time. His theory is based on the idea that cognitive development is a construction and that the individual constructs knowledge. This approach implied a disruption from earlier knowledge discourse. The progressive influences remained but evolved into a psychologically based progressivism that had a focus on personal development and general mental abilities (Carlgren et. al., 2006).

Also, in the drama field at that time, there was an increased interest in pedagogical and psychological aspects of drama (Rasmusson, 2000). However, while in the educational sector there was a focus on theories concerning individuals' cognitive development, in the drama field there was more focus on social development. Influences came especially from later approaches to developmental psychology, according to which the parts (mind, emotions etc.) not are to be seen as separated, but as interconnected (Askland & Sataoen, 2014). It was a displacement of emphasis to drama as a creative process and method, and a view that drama exercises have an intrinsic value. One of the first to express the view that drama is a pedagogical method was Dan Lipschütz, a Swedish drama practitioner.⁵³ During the 1960s and 1970s, various influencing factors contributed to a dominating practice of drama as a method for individual and group development. The spread of drama to different sectors might have contributed to this, as the interplay between different practices contributes to discursive formations (Foucault (1969/1972, 1991). Influences came from humanist psychology, social psychology and different group movements in United States as for example human potential movement, and from educational drama in the United Kingdom (Rasmusson, 2000). A common idea was that

⁵³ There were also advocates for drama as an aesthetic subject, which led to a debate about drama as art form or teaching method (Rasmusson, 2000).

individual interior development precedes social development. In the following, I will mention three representatives of the approach to drama as method, and whose thoughts show influences from developmental psychology. These influences contributed collaboratively to the displacement of drama practice in Sweden.

The English drama educator Peter Slade (1912-2004) emphasized the importance to stimulate the children's spontaneous dramatic play. He introduced an interactive form of dramatic acting, "Child drama", which had a focus on spontaneous expressions and inner experiences (Slade, 1954). His successor Brian Way (1967), who introduced these ideas to the Swedish drama field, argued that drama enables the development of different aspect of the personality. In the beginning of a drama process, the focus should lie on individual inquiry of one's own resources (Way, 1967). Later, social environment is included and as a next step to other ways of living. Way focused on the process, on the experience here and now. He included non-dramatic exercises in the work with drama. Individual exploration and the release of one's own resources contribute to the development of sensitivity towards others (ibid.).

The Swedish drama pedagogue and drama researcher Lennart Wiechel had a similar approach to drama as Way, but he put a greater emphasis on the group process and the importance of developing a capability to function in a group (Wiechel, 1983). Through interaction in a group, in a climate of openness and acceptance, he argues, the individual can fulfill herself. Wiechel argued that drama contribute to social competence.

Dan Lipschütz also highlighted social development (Lipschütz, 1976), developing *dynamic pedagogics* in the 1960s which was focused on group dynamic and social development. It was based on humanistic psychology and also on the view that changes in society start with individual interior development. This requires a non-authoritarian leadership. By discovering one's own situation and resources, the individual can develop the capability for active participation in the construction of her or his own life and of society (Lipschütz, 1976).

According to the narratives considered here drama was positioned as a method, both by the curriculum, Lgr 62 and by the use of drama as personal and social

development within different sectors⁵⁴. These factors contributed to a practice of drama as a method in Swedish school education, then not connected with any teaching about drama techniques. Different terms were used, such as pedagogical drama, dramatic and drama pedagogy, but the word theatre did not appear.

2.2.5 Interactive theatre and a societal perspective

In the following, I highlight the change to a more prominent societal focus on drama that was interconnected with interactive forms of drama and theatre, and group theatres. These were influenced by an increasing radicalization within public debate after the student revolts in 1968. Such influences affected both the cultural and educational sectors. The group theatres were characterized by a non-hierarchical organization and by democratic working forms, which had an influence also on drama pedagogues practice (Rasmusson, 2000).

Progressivism got a boost in Sweden in the 1970s, through a discourse with radical political orientation. Within the education sector there was an intense debate concerning different views on knowledge. The importance of communication and social relations for development and learning was emphasized (Morawski, 2010). Communication and communicative ability were highlighted in the curriculum, Lgr 80, and in the commentary material. In Lgr 80, a variety of working forms was recommended: common in whole class, small groups, in pairs and individually. Work in small groups was considered to provide possibilities for the pupils to share different experiences, and to develop the capability to collaborate (Sternudd, 2000). However, group work has been given a weak position within school education in Sweden, while work in whole class and individual work has been frequently used (Carlgren, Klette, Mýrdal, Schnack and Simola (2006). According to a report from the Swedish Schools Inspectorate (2017) this is still the case.

During this period, the idea about *the competent child* emerged. According to this, children are not defined by what they can not, but by what they can, and are seen as active agents (Helander, 2014). It is also connected with the view that the children have the right to express their opinions and be listened to.

⁵⁴ Drama expanded in different sectors in Sweden, for example in healthcare, social care and the leisure sector.

In Lgr 80, drama appeared as an art form, as a way for personal and social development, and as a method for learning in several subjects. However, a major change of drama practice was related to factors outside the educational system, even if they also affected how drama was used in school. Drama and theatre were highlighted as ways to develop a consciousness and analysis of societal conditions (Rasmusson, 2000). Paulo Freire's liberating and critical pedagogy was discussed, and his ideas spread. Freire (1970/2000) highlighted dialogue as a way to verbalize thoughts and experiences and thereby become conscious about conditions. Dialogue can contribute to collective activities and to liberation and changes in society, according to Freire. Practitioners within drama and theatre in Sweden were inspired by this narrative. Different forms of drama and theatre emerge where the audience was encouraged to participate actively (Rasmusson, 2000). The borders between drama and theatre became more blurred as a consequence of this. One form will be mentioned here which has had an impact on how drama is practiced in Swedish schools, forum play.

Forum play can best be explained as "the result of a mixture of three concepts, namely Socio-analytic role-play, Value Clarification⁵⁵ and Forum Theatre" (Österlind, 2011a, p. 247). *Socio-analytic role-play* was developed by Björn and Helena Magnér. Its theoretical basis was a dialectical view on the relationship between individuals and society, in that society constructs the individual and the individual constructs society. Magnér and Magnér (1976) argued that the individual needs to develop a consciousness about society and a confidence in one's personal capacity to change conditions. The method was based on themes close to participants' real life experiences and included discussions and role play. *Forum Theatre* was developed by the Brazilian theatre artist and educator Augusto Boal. Boal was a compatriot of Freire, and was influenced by his liberating pedagogy (see the previous page in this thesis). In Forum Theatre, the actors played a situation with a theme from everyday life and where one of the characters was oppressed. Then, the scene was repeated and the audience was invited to stop the action and replace the oppressed in order to try other ways to handle the situation. Boal (1974/2000) said

⁵⁵ The Swedish term is *värderingsövningar* and are exercises where participants investigate and reflect on their own values concerning a theme or issue.

that investigation of different ways to change the situation through Forum theatre implied a preparation for actions in real life. As in Magnér's socio-analytic role play, reflection and action are highlighted as important factors (Sternudd, 2000). Katrin Byréus (1990/2010) developed *Forum Play* for Swedish conditions and different educational settings. Byréus argued that its purposes are to develop self-knowledge and the capacity to handle conflicts, and to analyze injustices on different societal levels.

However, in compulsory school education, forum play has been used a method for social development in school classes from this point onwards, which implies a displacement of focus to a social perspective, and an uncoupling from political issues. Such a displacement can be seen as a part of how drama is practiced in Swedish schools. The dominating discourse concerning social fosterage produces a focus on relations between the pupils, but not on an inquiry of issues on a societal level. This discourse appears for example in *Värdegrundsboken* by Zackari and Modigh (2000), a book about fundamental values in relation to Swedish school policy, and written as a part of the Ministry of Education's Värdegrundsprojekt (In English: Fundamental values-project)⁵⁶. According to my analysis, drama becomes in this discourse a method for socialization between individuals, but not a tool for the critical analysis of societal issues (see also Fredriksson, 2013; Löf, 2011).

2.2.6 Efficiency, free choice and focus on knowledge

In the 1990s, major changes took place within the educational field in Sweden, including in compulsory school. The changes concerned school policy and organization of education, which also implied a disruption for the conditions and practice of drama in schools in Sweden.

A neo-liberal discourse became dominant in Western countries during the late 1900s. A breeding ground for this was an increased globalization (increased trade across national borders) and economic instability, along with a rightward shift in many countries (Börjesson, 2016). The basic ideas of neoliberalism are a free market economy, a reduced public sector and the individual's freedom to choose. The

⁵⁶ This project was initiated in order to highlight the fundamental values formulated in the general part of the subsequent curriculum Lpo 94 as "a non-negotiable point of departure of all work in school" (Morawski, 2010, p. 214). See also the next section about the new curriculum and its separation of two parts.

influence on Swedish policy came successively and was made possible because of an economic recession, and a growing critique of both public bureaucracy and school policy (Börjesson, 2016; Morawski, 2010). In Sweden, market governance had a great influence on educational policy. Since the early 1900s, there had been a struggle between traditionalists and representatives for progressive pedagogy. In the beginning of the 1980s, the number of critical voices against progressivism increased, by the so-called *Kunskapsrörelsen* (in English translated to ‘Knowledge movement’). Representatives of his approach criticized an emphasis on personal and social development within progressivism, and argued for scientific and acquisition knowledge. The critique against progressive education was often summarized with the term *flum* (in English: ‘fuzzy’). As Rasmusson (2000, p. 145) points out, the term ‘fuzzy’ included, among other things, drama and “other activity pedagogical working forms”⁵⁷. The problems with schools were considered to be caused by lack of efficiency and productivity. In the debate, both political and pedagogical arguments were used. (Gustavsson, 2002; Rasmusson, 2000.) The traditional view of knowledge has been dominating Swedish school policy from the on, and the neo-liberal influence has therefore been connected with this (see for example Wahlström, 2016a).

Another factor that influenced this process of change was the increasing information technology, which led to new demands on education. Information technology implied that it is impossible to choose a limited part of all information as teaching matter. The concept of knowledge became distinguished from information (Gustavsson, 2000). Knowledge was now considered as something carried by individuals, and about being able to search for and critically evaluate information. This implied a need for a wider view of the concept of knowledge and an interest in practical, tacit knowledge (ibid.). During the 1990s, the concept of knowledge became problematized for the first time in Swedish school policy documents.

In the proposal from the Preparation Committee for the new curriculum (SOU 1992:94), there emerged a socio cultural perspective of knowledge⁵⁸. It was argued

⁵⁷ [“andra aktivitetspedagogiska arbetsformer”]

⁵⁸ ‘Socio cultural perspective’ can be seen as an umbrella including different approaches which have in common a view that knowledge is constructed in interaction, in a specific context. In the report from the Preparation Committee (SOU 1992:94), Vygotsky is referred to.

that the development of knowledge is connected to actual cultural context and praxis. “[K]nowledge exists in situations, in human practice and in the body.” (Skolverket, 1997, p. 30.)⁵⁹ The individual develops knowledge as an active, ongoing process. In the proposal four different forms of knowledge were described: factual knowledge (knowing *that*), understanding knowledge (knowing as meaning), skill knowledge (knowing *how*) and familiarity knowledge (tacit knowledge). The various forms of knowledge presuppose and interact with one another. It was also argued that all these forms are included in every knowledge field and that they are not hierarchical, but that the relation between them could vary depending on subjects and individuals. (Skolverket, 1997, p. 52.)

In the proposal, it was argued that the question about *bildung*⁶⁰ needed to be re-actualized. This was based on the idea that education should provide possibilities both to acquire necessary knowledge and to an ongoing formation as a whole person. It can be understood that the wide approach to knowledge also included *bildung*. In the curriculum text, this concept was mentioned but not separated from other formulations about knowledge and development.

A basic idea presented in the proposal was that education should provide possibilities for knowledge acquisition and promote pupils’ capability to create knowledge. It was argued that this capability involves reflecting and making judgements of practical experiences, and is evolved through inquiry and communication through different forms of expression, verbal as well as “song, dance, visual arts and drama” (Skolverket, 1997, p. 35). According to the proposal, such activities should not be separated from other education “but become an integrated part of it” (ibid., p. 35)⁶¹.

The Preparation Committee argued that education must be based on fundamental democratic values and create prerequisites for the pupils to develop a democratic approach. Fosterage and knowledge cannot be seen as separated from each other. The subsequent curriculum (Lpo 94) contained a general part with fundamental

⁵⁹ [K[unskapen finns i situationer, i mänsklig praxis och i kroppen. (Skolverket, 1997, p. 30.)]

⁶⁰ The concept *bildung* is German and is used here because so it usually is translated in English texts when is referred to the Swedish concept *bildning*. (See also chapter 1.2.1.)

⁶¹ [“utan bli en integrerad del av den” (ibid., p. 35)]

values and overarching goals for all education. In syllabuses for each school subject, specific goals were formulated.

In the general part of Lpo 94, these forms of knowledge were included:

Knowledge is a complex concept. Knowledge is expressed in various forms such as facts, understanding, skills and familiarity - which presuppose and interact with each other. Schoolwork must allow for different forms of knowledge and create a learning where these forms are balanced and become a whole. (Lpo 94, p. 6)⁶²

This formulation expresses a wide view of knowledge where different forms of knowledge interact in a non-hierarchical way. It was said in the curriculum that all education should include some general perspectives; historical perspectives, environmental perspectives, international perspectives and ethical perspectives. This indicates that knowledge and fosterage are seen as inseparable from each other. The double mission of fostering and education is expressed in Lpo 94, in a section about tasks for the school: “In a deeper sense education and upbringing involve developing and passing on a cultural heritage – values, traditions, language, knowledge – from one generation to the next” (Lpo 94, p. 5). Socialization into existing society and culture is highlighted here as a basic task for education, together with an endeavor to foster citizens who actively participate in society development.

On the political level, there was a striving for decentralization and for more local responsibility for the compulsory school in Sweden (Morawski, 2010). The Preparation Committee’s work was preceded by a decision that a goal oriented school should be imposed. At a national level, overarching goals should be formulated for all education and specific goals for each subject. The goals should steer education but provide possibilities to interpret and adapt on a local level. Another committee formulated a proposal on how education should be assessed (SOU 1992:86). Their specification of achievement goals was based on a behaviourist and hierarchical view of knowledge (Morawski, 2010). This led to a

⁶² In quotations from the curricula Lpo 94 and Lgr 11, the English versions from the Swedish National Agency for Education are used.

curriculum (Lpo 94), with a general part consisting of fundamental values and overall goals for all education, and syllabuses for all subjects with achievement goals. This implies that the curriculum was “a compromise product between two steering discourses, the process oriented and the result oriented” (Morawski, 2010, p. 210)⁶³. The process-oriented discourse produce an education where goals and process are inseparably interwoven while the result oriented discourse produces an education with a focus on the acquisition and assessment of knowledge. The idea was that the general part of the curriculum contained such things that should permeate all education in all subjects. The formulations there were general while the achievement goals in the syllabuses were concrete and precisely formulated. This led to a practice where the achievement goals were given more importance than the more general goals. “Thereby there was a displacement of the steering potential, from what education shall strive towards, to what shall be assessed.” (Morawski, 2010, p. 208.)⁶⁴ The influence of neo-liberalism appear in this emphasis on knowledge that it is possible to measure and compare.

The curriculum contributed to a hierarchization of what was considered as important knowledge. The dominant discourse was that theoretical knowledge and acquisition knowledge were considered more important than practical and aesthetic knowledge, according to my analysis. It also produced a practice where propositional knowledge had a dominating position in relation to fosterage. This can be related to Foucault’s (1975/1991) reasoning that a separation of knowledge, and of organization of activities in education contribute to disciplining. The separation of activities in time and space becomes a ‘technique of subjection’ (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 155).

In the general part of Lpo 94, drama was mentioned as one of several aesthetic forms of expression. It was stated that the pupils should have possibilities to experience different forms of knowledge, and to try and develop different forms of expression. This corresponds to the Preparation Committee’s proposal that different forms of expressions should not be a separated part of education but instead be an integrated

⁶³ [...] en kompromissprodukt mellan två styrdiskurser, den processinriktade och den resultatnriktade (Morawski, 2010, p. 210).]

⁶⁴ [Därmed försköts den styrande potentialen från vad utbildning ska sträva mot till vad som ska examineras. (Morawski, 2010, p. 208.)]

part. In the curriculum, there were also written more general formulations concerning aesthetics. Intellectual, practical, sensual and aesthetic aspects should be paid attention to (Lpo 94). One of the general knowledge goals was that pupils know how to use knowledge from the scientific, technical, social science, humanities and aesthetic fields of knowledge. There was no specific definition of the concept of aesthetics, neither in the curriculum nor in the report from the Preparation Committee. Different approaches to 'aesthetics' can be identified in the curriculum's text, for example aesthetics as experience, as way of expression, as a skill, as form of knowledge, and as an instrumental tool for learning other subjects or skills (Thorgersen & Alerby, 2005). In the general part of the curriculum, formulations concerning the aesthetic field were wide and possible to interpret in different ways. This was in line with the idea for the curriculum that it provided a space for interpretations on a local level. Another idea in line with this was not to mention ways to work in school (Sternudd, 2000). Drama was mentioned in syllabuses for some subjects, as a help for the development of language and for learning. However, no achievement goals for drama were mentioned.

A hierarchization appears in Lpo 94, between different ways of knowing, in that play was considered as important for younger pupils. It was stated in the curriculum that "[i]n the early years of schooling, play in particular is of great importance in helping pupils to acquire knowledge." (Lpo 94, p. 6). A possible interpretation is that this says that play was not important as a way of knowing in later school years. With a Foucauldian (1975/1991) approach, it can be seen as a chronological division of activities and a governing towards a more and more rational use of time (see also Øxsnes, 2010). This in turn might imply that on a policy-level, the explorative and unpredictable process in drama regardless of pupils' age was not considered as important.

As a whole, in this curriculum, a fragmented picture of drama appeared in that it in some places it was described as an art form, and in some as a resource for learning. Thereby, the curriculum Lpo 94 produced much room for different interpretation concerning if, when and how to include drama in school.

The vague formulations about drama and other aesthetic activities contributed to different interpretive possibilities, which in turn contributed to the variety of ways in which drama is taught in Swedish schools. Decentralization of the school and local

freedom produced differences concerning practice of drama, *if* it was used and *how* it was used.

2.2.7 Decentralization of the school

Lpo94 was written in connection with the discourse of the decentralization of the school. The decision was taken to municipalize school, and it became possible to start free schools (*friskolereformen*, 1992), and the free choice of school (*fria skolvalet*) was inserted. The free choice of school implied that pupils and their parents could freely choose which school to attend (Morawski, 2010). The municipalisation of school was realized in 1996, and implied that the main responsibility for schools was removed from state to local governments. The idea behind the decentralization of the school was that local decisions regarding the use of resources would contribute to increased efficiency. An idea was also to emphasize the individual's right to influence, and thus it implied a striving towards increased individualization. The individual and the individual's responsibility were also emphasized in the general part of the curriculum, as in the following formulation: "The inviolability of human life, individual freedom and integrity, that equal value of all people [...]" (Lpo 94, p. 3)⁶⁵. In a report from Skolverket (2000) it is argued that "[...] fundamental values mainly is about attitudes, about how individuals respond, communicate and evaluate each other. [...] in the interaction between individuals and groups who are in the activities." (Skolverket, 2000, p. 9.)⁶⁶ This can be interpreted as a displacement of emphasis from individuals as citizens, to responsibility on an individual level (Edling, 2012, Österlind, 1998). According to neo-liberal rationality, the individual is responsible for her own life and simultaneously be willing to adapt to the market's requirements (Fejes, 2006).

This local freedom consisted of the ways to realize the national educational goals could vary. Local freedom was termed *frirum* (in English: free space). The free space implied that teachers and pupils could interpret national goals and decide how to

⁶⁵ ["Människolivets okränkbarhet, individens frihet och integritet, alla människors lika värde [...]" (Lpo 94, p. 3)]

⁶⁶ "[...] värdegrunden främst handlar om förhållningssätt, om hur människor bemöter, kommunicerar och värderar varandra. [...] i samspelet mellan de individer och grupper som befinner sig i verksamheterna." (Skolverket, 2000, p. 9.)

concretize and organize education. There was a striving to individualize education, and at the same time give scope for pupils to have more influence over and responsibility for their own studies. Whole-class teaching was to an increasing extent replaced by pupil's individual work (Carlgren et al, 2006; Österlind, 1998). The ideal of the individual was the autonomous individual who can plan and complete tasks and at the same time adapt to given frames. This indicates that values and view of knowledge are inter-twined, that is to say education and fostering cannot be seen as separated.

Local differences influenced to what extent and how drama was used within school education. Many pupils did not have any drama education at all during their years in school. Some schools offered drama as a temporary part of education, for shorter or longer periods. There was also a limited number of schools where drama was included as a continuous part of education. Drama could be included as a part of thematic, interdisciplinary schoolwork, as temporary cultural projects or as a scheduled subject. It could also differ regarding to what extent focus was on drama as an art form, as a method for personal and social development or a tool for learning different subject content. Drama pedagogues often were contracted temporarily to teach about fundamental value-related matters. This, together with increased individualization within compulsory schooling, might have contributed to the consequence that drama practice in Swedish schools to large extent continued to be a method for personal and social development. This description is based on my own knowledge as a drama practitioner in Swedish compulsory school and is supported by the earlier mentioned (p. 25) interview studies undertaken by the drama researchers Fredriksson (2013) and Öfverström (2006). Both studies indicate that teachers in compulsory school use drama in teaching as a tool for learning in different school subjects, as a method for personal and social development or as art expression, but these components are not interwoven in the same teaching occasions. This can be related to the curriculum Lpo 94 describing drama as an aesthetic expression *or* as a resource for learning.

A curriculum consisting of two parts with diverging perspectives on education and knowledge, vague formulations concerning aesthetic expressions and with a local freedom to make interpretations has produced a fragmented practice of drama in

Swedish schools, according to my analysis. Fragmentation here signifies decomposition, an increased distance between the different fragments and where space for each of the fragments was reduced. Drama was reduced to an instrumental tool for learning a specific content *or* to a method for thematic education about fundamental value-related matters *or* to work with temporary art projects. The curriculum produced a hierarchy of what was considered as important knowledge in that theoretical and factual knowledge was considered as more important than practical and aesthetic knowledge. It can be related to Foucault's (1975/1991) reasoning about the division of activities in space and time as a tool for disciplining, *dividing practices*. It also produced a practice where knowledge had a dominating position in relation to fosterage. An increased focus on individualized education gave less space for experimental activities together in the classroom (Österlind, 1998). This relates to Foucault's (1975/1991) reasoning about individualization as a technique of governing towards desired behavior through, for example, controlling observations and normalization through correction of inappropriate behavior and rewarding desired behavior and performance. The individualization implied fosterage of autonomous individuals who flexibly can adapt to a changing labor market. These factors contributed to a marginalization of drama as practice in most of the compulsory schools in Sweden. Decentralization of the school and the free space made it possible to include drama in education, to a lesser or greater extent. For example, there were a few schools where drama constituted an included part of the education for all pupils: in other schools drama class became an option during some school years, while drama in many schools not was offered at all.

Simultaneously, the socio-cultural perspective contributed to a strengthened theoretical basis for drama as field. The idea that knowledge exists in practice and in the body, that the individual creates knowledge as an active process, and that knowledge and fosterage constitute a whole have contributed to the current approach to drama. In Sweden, this has been combined with a reform pedagogical idea about each individual's creative ability. Among drama practitioners, the dominated view from then on is that that drama is both art form and method (see Rasmusson, 2000).

The neo-liberal discourse governed what was considered as important in Swedish compulsory school in the late 1900s. Factors that allowed this discourse also contributed to major changes in the educational sector in early 2000s. Among other

things, the globalization have led to increased transnational mobility of people and goods. According to a neo-liberal logic, this require a free market and increased competitiveness and productivity. Central principles for this are free choice and competition, efficiency and achievements of results. This has been permeating different sectors within the society, for example the education. It has led to extensive reforms within the educational system, so also in Sweden. This takes us to the current school policy in Sweden and how drama is positioned in compulsory school today.

2.3 Drama in Swedish school today

The neo-liberal discourse affected a radical change of course, at the time of the millennium shift. Several influencing factors contributed to this change. The decentralization of school together with possibilities to start free schools led to the assessment of pupils' results varying significantly between schools. There emerged critique regarding a lack of national coordination of assessment (Morawski, 2010). Sweden participated from 2000 and onwards in many international comparative studies (PISA, PIRLS and TIMSS). Both national and international studies indicated that Swedish pupils' school achievements declined and that the differences increased between different schools' results. It was considered that an equivalent school for all pupils demanded increased state control. (Biesta, 2011; Skolverket, 2012.)

It implies a definition of the term *equivalent* as related to achievement of results (Wahlström, 2014). This appears, for example, in the following quotation from a Swedish report about the results in the PISA-survey (*PISA 2015*): “[A] school system is more equivalent if as large proportion of the pupils as possible achieve a basic level of skills” (Skolverket, 2016, p. 34).⁶⁷

Parallel with this was a public debate focusing on the need for more knowledge in school. What knowledge means was not discussed. There was an active discourse, in which the meaning of the concept ‘knowledge’ was implicit. Knowledge then represents something that has a use value (financial and productive), which is seen as

⁶⁷ [”[E]tt skolsystem är mer likvärdigt om en så stor andel av eleverna som möjligt uppnår en grundläggande nivå av färdigheter” (Skolverket, 2016, p. 34)]

useful and lies outside the personal (Gustavsson, 2000, 2002). Jan Björklund, then the Swedish Education Minister, said in an interview in the daily newspaper *Sydsvenskan* (Leijnse, 2011, April 4) “I mean that the purpose of the school is to teach pupils knowledge, while others think that its purpose is to learn to cooperate, or learn to learn, and that subject knowledge is not so important.”⁶⁸ This can be interpreted as if knowledge is about to deliver better results in tests and demonstrate learned facts. Björklund said that the opposite of this is fuzzy. As Gustavsson (2002) points out, the propositional tradition is set as opposed to a progressive educational tradition. In the debate about school, there was opposition between these approaches, and political and pedagogical argument were mixed. Questions about purposes for education were not discussed (Biesta, 2011). The question of purpose was displaced by a dominating emphasis on efficiency and achieved results.

During the period 2010-2011, several changes were implemented within the Swedish school system. From July 2011, Sweden has a new Education Act (SFS 2010:800) and a new curriculum for compulsory school (Lgr 11)⁶⁹. The Education Act states that all education shall be equivalent (SFS 2010:800, 1 chapter, §9) and that the education must include certain specified subjects (SFS 2010:800, 10 chapter, § 4)⁷⁰. Formal grades are now given earlier than before: national tests are carried out from earlier grade levels: and there are more detailed formulated knowledge goals. The Swedish Schools Inspectorate has been given an expanded commission to scrutinize schools (Morawski, 2010).

Lgr 11 contains a general part with fundamental values and overarching goals for all education. This part is almost identical to the previous in Lpo 94. Thereby, it is still characterized by process orientation in that goals and processes appear interwoven. However, the syllabuses are very different from the previous since core contents and knowledge requirements are described more in detail and where measurable capabilities are in the focus. Simultaneously, subject-related knowledge

⁶⁸ [“Jag menar att skolan är till för att lära eleverna kunskaper, medan andra tycker att den är till för att man ska lära sig att samarbeta, eller lära sig att lära, och att ämneskunskaper inte är lika viktiga.” (Leijnse, 2011, 4 april.)]

⁶⁹ This curriculum was revised 2017, but this did not imply any changes concerning drama in compulsory school education.

⁷⁰ Education in compulsory school comprises compulsory subjects, which are stated in the Educational Act. In addition to these, there shall be “the pupil’s choice” and “the school’s choice”. (See also the chapter 4 about method and description of participating schools.)

is given a prominent position in relation to general competences (Wahlström, 2014; Wahlström & Sundberg, 2015). (See also the discussion about general competences in section 1.2.1 in this thesis).

The vague and interpretable formulations about aesthetic expressions and aesthetic aspects remain the same as in Lpo 94, but that they are not mentioned in the new syllabuses for school subjects. This curriculum produces a practice where the focus lies on measurable capabilities and on results (Biesta, 2011; Wahlström & Sundberg, 2015).

The importance of aesthetic aspects of learning processes is often highlighted in the debate within the educational field in Sweden. The concept of ‘aesthetic learning processes’ is often used nowadays, but there is no common definition of what this means. On the one hand, it can be understood as a striving that aesthetic experiences and expressions should permeate all education, and on the other hand aesthetic activities can be considered as instrumental tools for achieving better results in other subjects (see for example Fredriksson, 2013; Thavenius, 2002). There tends not to be more than general formulations, which do not formally obligate the teaching in concrete educational settings. However, the Educational Act, and the curriculum, Lgr 11, together produce a practice of the aesthetic forms of knowledge, including drama, as a potential but not required instrumental tool for an effective learning in school subjects.

In line with Foucault’s reasoning that a discourse is related to surrounding discourses (Foucault, 1969/1972), discourses about knowledge, aesthetic activities and fosterage are seen as active in the educational field. As mentioned above, the propositional knowledge discourse produces a hierarchy of different forms of knowledge and an idea that theoretical subjects are considered more important than aesthetic and practical school subjects. Aesthetic activities are seen as useful if they benefit learning in a theoretical subject. This can be related to Foucault’s (1975/1991) thoughts about dividing practices.

The unilateral focus on knowledge implied that education about fundamental values was organized apart from ordinary education. Above, I mentioned that the curriculum Lpo 94 implied an emphasis to responsibility on individual level, and that the formulations in the general part of Lgr 11 are almost identical. The curriculum produces individuals who are “free” and develops an ability to act “in responsible

freedom” (Lgr 11/17, p. 7)⁷¹. This can be related to Fejes’ (2008) reasoning about that neoliberalism “promotes a specific form of “freedom”, [...] freedom as a form of self-governance” (Fejes, 2008, p. 655). This in turn relates to Foucault’s (1988) thoughts about *technologies of the self*, the practices in which the subjects constitute themselves. The process of subject creation takes place in interplay with the social and historical context. Dominating discourse concerning desired capabilities and qualities governs what is defined as competence, and this in turn promotes certain ways of being. This might lead to that the autonomous individual governs herself to act in accordance with the prevailing discourse (Foucault, 1975/1991, 1988).

This contributes to a focus on individual’s interior resources and wellbeing (Edling, 2012; Gunnarsson, 2015). From the late 1900s and onwards there has been a displacement towards psychosocial health and health promotion (Gunnarsson, 2015). These issues have in many schools been dealt with in a specific Life Competence Education⁷². Drama has often been used as a method in this education. This produces a practice of drama as method for personal and social development, mostly as part of thematic education beside ordinary education⁷³ (see for example Löf, 2011).

Simultaneously there is an active discourse about aesthetic activities as something unquestionably good. Experiences of and own activities in different art expressions are considered to have an intrinsic value. At the same time, arts activities are considered as something apart from ordinary education (Thavenius, 2002). Rationalization and the reduction of the public sector have been realized in connection with financial cuts that have affected the educational sector. The space for art activities have decreased significantly in many Swedish schools since the late 1990s. This has led to a diminished space for collaborations between schools and the cultural sectors on local level. Since 2008, the Swedish Arts Council offers possibility for schools to apply for *Creative School* grant. The purpose with *Creative School* is “[...] to strengthen the collaboration between the school and the professional cultural life”⁷⁴ Such art activities are mostly temporary activities, for

⁷¹ “[I ansvarig frihet” (Lgr 11/17, p. 7)]

⁷² The Swedish name is *Livskunskap*.

⁷³ This discourse has been identified as a therapeutic discourse, in several Swedish research studies. Gunnarsson is an example of these researchers, and is chosen because I will refer to her also in the methodological chapter.

⁷⁴ “[...] att stärka samverkan mellan skolan och det professionella kulturlivet”.] (From the Swedish Arts Council’s website, www.kulturradet.se. Downloaded 7 December 2015.)

shorter or longer periods. They are often realized as something besides ordinary school education, according to an evaluation of *Creative School* grant in Sweden (Myndigheten för kulturanalys, 2013). When used as art expression, the term drama is sometimes used and sometimes the term theatre.

The current Curriculum for Swedish compulsory school produces a fragmented and marginalized practice of drama, in a similar way as Lpo 94 did. Drama is positioned in terms of policy as a method for thematic education about fundamental value-related matters *or* as work with temporary art projects *or* as an instrumental tool for learning a specific subject-related content. On a general level, this produces a practice where drama seems to mostly be used as an instrumental tool, subordinated the benefit for learning other subjects or skills, and that minimal attention is given to art form specific knowing (see also Fredriksson, 2013).

2.4 Conclusions of the genealogical analysis

The genealogical analysis has been undertaken in order to analyze the current situation for drama in the compulsory school system in Sweden. Taking a Foucauldian approach, a point of departure for analysis has been to trace moments of discontinuities and ruptures which constitute displacements and transformation of discourses. Maybe it is more adequate to talk about processes of condensation since different interrelated factors do not change exactly at the same time. The analysis also includes the identification of interrelated factors and of interplays between these. The questions guiding this analysis have been concerned with how different pedagogical and aesthetic trends have influenced drama practices and how drama is taught today in school. Which changes of pedagogical and aesthetic trends have contributed to how drama is practiced in Swedish school today? How are changes of approach to drama interrelating with changes of the educational system?

Each subsection of the section *Drama as practice in relation to fosterage and knowledge* describe a change that have contributed to today's practice of drama in school. Before the 1800s, the borders between drama, theatre and play were blurred, and not age-specific activities, but school education was only for some.

Dramatizations have been used in Swedish school education from the Middle Ages

and onwards. Initially, they were used as a tool for moral and Christian fosterage. The decline of the Church's power over education and the emergence of childhood as category implied a shift in that theatre and other art forms aimed to support ethical fosterage. From the late 1800s, reform pedagogy influenced both school education and drama pedagogy. An emphasis lay on pupils' active participation and collaboration, community activity, play and creative activities, and on empirical experiences. Subject knowledge, arts fosterage and social fosterage were seen as interwoven. After the mid- 1900s, there was an increased focus on individualized education in order to meet pupils' different prerequisites to acquire knowledge, and to attain differentiation. Fosterage was directed towards the child as future labor. From the implementation of Lgr 62, drama has had a weak position within policy for Swedish compulsory school and one reason for this was the focus on individualization and traditional education. Drama was used as a method for learning in different subjects. During the 1960s and 1970s, there were an increasing use of drama as a method for social development. From the late 1900s and onwards, the neo-liberal influence implies a focus on efficiency and results, which in turn produces a hierarchy of different form of knowledge and an idea that theoretical subjects are considered more important than aesthetic and practical subjects.

The close relationship between approaches to drama and educational trends has been made visible. Dominating discourses concerning knowledge, fosterage, aesthetic activities and childhood contribute in an interconnected way to practice drama in Sweden. The prevailing drama discourse in Sweden is influenced by a reform pedagogical approach with its focus on experience-based and explorative learning, and collaboration, and by a socio-cultural view that the individual is an active constructor of knowledge and that knowledge is contextually contingent. Such an approach collides with the neo-liberal idea about individualization and competition, and its emphasis on propositional knowledge and achievements of results, that today permeates school policy in Sweden.

School education is dominated by a results-oriented discourse with a focus on propositional knowledge and measurable capabilities that produces a hierachization of forms of knowledge. The focus lies on certain knowledge but not on an interplay of various forms of knowledge. There is a focus on measurable capabilities and results, but not on processes and on experiential and explorative learning. This

benefits knowledge that can easily be pre-formulated as standardized requirements. The pupils are limited to being performers. This can be related to *who* it is possible to be and become when participating in school education, and to which ways of knowing are made possible. Ideas concerning which knowledge school education should prioritize and who the subject is intended to be, are throughout interconnected. In the introduction to section 2.1, I said that the term *foster* refers to who the subject can be and become within a particular society and the qualities desired the subject develop to contribute to the society's further development. The dominating educational discourse produce a certain interpretation and practice of the education's mission to foster and provide knowledge. This discourse highlights individual outcomes and competition, but not processes and relations. This leads to the consequence that the knowledge requirements formulated in the syllabuses for school subjects govern education in Sweden. The general part of the curriculum for compulsory school containing fundamental values and overarching goals for education is given a subordinated position, in spite of the fact that the idea is that what is formulated there shall permeate all education. This part is an expression of a process-oriented discourse while the syllabuses produce a results-oriented practice.

Drama is mentioned only in the general part of the current curriculum for compulsory school, but the formulations about this are vague and possible to interpret in different ways. School policy documents govern how drama is positioned in school. A conclusion is that the current curriculum for compulsory school produces a fragmented and marginalized practice of drama. It produces a practice of drama as a method *or* as an art expression termed drama or theatre.

This analysis has included school policy documents, pedagogical texts and texts about drama, which implies a focus on the macro-level. Simultaneously, the division of activities in time and space as disciplining techniques can be seen as an indirect exercise of power on a micro-level. Strategies on a macro-level are conditioning practice on a micro-level, but they also depend on local strategies and conditions. Thereby, strategies on a macro-level and local practices condition each other (Foucault, 1976/1990). The macro-level can concern the state, law system, etc., and a micro-level can be about local setups, such as for example the family, working place or school (Foucault, 1991).

Based on the thought about connections of politics on a micro- and on a macro-level, in addition to this genealogical analysis of drama in the compulsory school system in Sweden, I have undertaken an empirical study in which school classes participate that have drama as a recurring part of their education. Interconnections of the macro- and micro-levels of politics as they impact drama educational practices will be discussed in chapter 8. (Then it will be connected with Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988) idea about politics at micro- and macro-level, and which will be described in the next chapter.)

PART II

Methodological Approach

In this part, I present the methodological approach used in this thesis. The research issues concern learning processes in drama, and which components co-produce these. This implies that my focus is on ongoing processes. Learning processes in drama are considered as multifaceted and complex. Learning is seen as both an individual, interior and a situated, interactive process. What is learned, why this is learned, and how, are related to who the subject (the one who learns) can be and is supposed to become. This implies that learning processes are interrelated with processes of becoming. Thereby, epistemological perspectives are considered as interrelated with ontology.

In order to approach and create knowledge about how processes of learning in drama can be understood and described, I use post-constructionism as a theoretical tool. Post-constructionism derives from the gender researcher Nina Lykke (2009/2010; 2010), and can be described as moves “into and beyond stances” (Lykke, 2010, p. 133) of constructionism, social constructionism and post-humanism⁷⁵. The pre-fix “post” signifies “both “transgressing” and including” (ibid. p. 133). It is not an attempt to formulate a new theory, but a tool to catch sight of and critically emphasize different perspectives, and to include both discursive formations and embodied practices. A common feature for the perspectives used in this thesis is that they deal with phenomena that are characterized by complexity, that is to say they consist of several interacting components (Semetsky, 2009). Another common feature is that epistemology and ontology are seen as interconnected.

One of the approaches used in this thesis is Nomad philosophy. A point of departure for this approach is that theory is not seen as a firm principle beyond conscious thinking, and which can explain the empirical world from above. Theory

⁷⁵ The term “constructionism” can be seen as interchangeable with “constructivism”, but, as Lykke (2010, p. 135) says, “the two concepts have different genealogies”. Constructivism is among others connected to Piaget’s theories, and thereby with an idea that cognitive development can be understood as predetermined and linear. Based on the same reasoning, the term “social constructionism” is used instead of “social constructivism”.

does not hierarchically define practice but is seen as a practice which communicates with other practices. As the philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1995/2001, p. 36). argues, “[...] theory is an inquiry, which is to say, a practice: a practice of the seemingly fictive world that empiricism describes: a study of the conditions of legitimacy of practices in this empirical world that is in fact our own”. Theory and (other) practices are considered as working on the same plane, a plane of immanence. This implies, among other things, that knowledge is created as an encounter between theory and another practice, in the in-between.

Thereby, theory and method considerations are constructed as an inter-relational process, and as researcher, I move back and forth between theory and empirical data⁷⁶. The philosopher Rosi Braidotti (2002) describes a nomadic methodology in the following way:

This means going in between different discursive fields, passing through diverse spheres of intellectual discourse. Theory today happen ‘in transit’, moving on, passing through, creating connections where things were previously disconnected or seemed unrelated, where there seemed to be ‘nothing else to see’. [...] It is therefore crucial to learn how to think about processes and not only concepts. The challenge is in how to represent in-between zones and areas of experience or perception. (Braidotti, 2002, pp. 173-174.)

These ongoing moves between different sites imply that the research process is not carried out in a linear way. In the present part, I refer back to the discussion in chapter 2 regarding Foucault’s ideas about discourses and genealogy, and connect this with a nomadic approach.

In the following chapter, I provide a description of how post-constructionism is understood and applied in the present thesis. Chapter 4 deals with methods for the construction of data in the empirical study and tools for analysis of these, and a presentation of the participating schools.

⁷⁶ The thoughts presented about theory and practice imply an extended view on what “empirical” signifies (Massumi, 2002). However, for pragmatic reasons, I use the terms “empirical data” and “empirical study” when I discuss the production of data in connection with the participating schools in this research study.

3. Post-constructionism

“Post-constructionism” is an umbrella term for a cluster of theories that can contribute to an understanding about discursive formations, and “pre-discursive bodily and transcorporeal facticities or “phenomena” (Lykke, 2010, p. 133). It can provide a tool for an understanding of how knowledge is constructed as interior (cognitive) and exterior (social and physical) processes, and how these interrelate. In this thesis, within the broader frame of social constructionism, Dewey’s educational philosophy is used. Within the post-humanistic field, a nomadic approach based on Deleuze’s and Braidotti’s ideas is used as a lense, connected with Foucault’s thoughts.⁷⁷ It is a convergence between Dewey’s ideas and Nomad philosophy, and these are put in dialogue in the discussion about learning. The purpose is not to compare them but to create synergy. In line with Lykke’s (2010) reasoning, it can be understood as dialogue with different theories that have in common a view that knowing and being are constructions.

That post-constructionism includes discourse and materialities, and the relationship between these, implies that it is generally included within the post-humanistic field (Gunnarsson, 2015). Post-humanism gathers various theories that have evolved within feminist and postcolonial theories and within technology science (Åsberg, 2012). They have in common the premise that the human being is decentered, not viewed as the center. This implies an anti-anthropocentric view. Instead, the intertwined existence and mutual influence between human beings, nature and animals, things and environments are highlighted. However, this does not imply that all interacting actors are given equal focus in every research study. As Åsberg, Hultman and Lee (2012, p. 36)⁷⁸. point out, “the end goal is not to equate all actors, human or not, but to try to create a dialogical stance [...]”. In the present study, the focus lies on discursive formations, social interactions and materialities, and on the relations between these. Thereby, the study is situated in-between social-constructionism and post-humanism. In line with Gunnarsson’s (2015) reasoning, the

⁷⁷ As mentioned earlier, in the analysis of data these theories will be put in move together with drama theory presented in section 1.4.

⁷⁸ [“Slutmålet är dock inte att jämföra alla aktörer, mänskliga eller inte, utan att försöka skapa en dialogisk hållning [...]” (p. 36).]

term post-constructionism is considered as useful to highlight that the human being is not the only agent, but that a radical anti-anthropocentric stance is not taken.

In the following sections, I describe the theoretical approaches used in this thesis. They are discussed in the order they were chosen during the research process. Initially, I briefly present social constructionism and the reason for using Dewey's educational philosophy. In the subsequent description of Dewey's philosophy, a delimitation is made to ideas of relevance for my study. I also discuss why this approach is not considered sufficient as a tool for understanding learning processes in drama and the reason for additionally choosing Nomad philosophy. I describe Nomad philosophy, then with a focus on ideas and concepts central for the present study. In the following section about learning, the Nomad philosopher Deleuze's ideas are put in dialogue with Dewey's thoughts.

3.1 Social constructionism

A point of departure for the choice of theoretical tools is the thought that learning is seen as both an individual, interior and a situated, interactive process (see also section 1.1.2). Based on the thought that learning is a complex activity, and which is interrelated with processes of becoming, it is argued that one single theory cannot cover all aspects. This relates to Carlgren's (2011) and Illeris' (2015) reasoning that an acquisition perspective and a participation perspective complement each other in the understanding of learning processes. The acquisition perspective concerns the subject's cognitive construction of knowledge and the transfer of this between contexts (interior processes), and the participation perspective concerns the social and practice-based (exterior) processes.

According to social constructionism, who we are and can be is socially constructed. Knowledge is actively constructed in a social context, and is not seen as something static or valid for all contexts (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2009; Burr, 2003). In social interaction, the individual constructs knowledge through interrelated processes of cognition, and sensory and affective experiencing (see for example Berthoz, 2003/2006; Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2015).

However, there might be a risk that the focus moves between learning as an interior process on the one hand and as socially situated at the other hand, but without staying in the space in-between as well. This might imply a dichotomous thinking (Dewey, 1929/1958), that is to say a focus on either interior or exterior aspects of learning, but not on their interrelation. As Dewey argues, “the psychological and social sides [of the educational process] are organically related” so that “education cannot be regarded as a compromise between the two, or a superimposition on one upon the other” (Dewey, 1897/1972, p. 85. Quoted in Biesta, 2014, p. 29). It is not enough to describe a phenomenon from different viewpoints: it is required to also focus on the relational process between them (see for example Carlgren, 2011).

Based on these thoughts, within the field of social constructionism, Dewey’s educational philosophy can have relevance for this study. Earlier in this thesis (chapter 2), I discussed that reform pedagogy has had a significant importance for how drama is practiced within Swedish school education, and that Dewey is prominent within this pedagogical field. Therefore, I use Dewey’s philosophy as one theoretical tool here.

3.1.1 Dewey’s educational philosophy

Dewey’s philosophy is based on pragmatism. A point of departure for pragmatism is that knowledge has no general validity but is a tool to handle practical issues. The value of knowledge depends on its usefulness in practice (Gustavsson, 2000). Dewey (1916/2007) argues that knowledge is created through experiences here-and-now by using and applying previously acquired knowledge, and is directed towards future actions.

According to Dewey (1938/1997), knowing is created through experiences. A prerequisite for an experience to contribute to knowledge is that it is perceived as meaningful for the individual, and therefore it must be connected to the individual’s interest. For the experience to lead to explicit knowledge, it has to be linked to other experiences and previous knowledge through reflection. Thus, thinking is always related to an actual issue and, with its background in earlier experiences, about seeing which consequences a changed or new action might cause (Dewey, 1933). Because individuals carry with them different experiences and knowledge, the same

methods for learning are not useful for everyone. Education therefore has to provide a variation of means to create new knowledge (Dewey, 1916/2007).

From this, it also follows that the aims of education have to be related to the pupils' previous experiences. Dewey argues that externally determined aims might lead to inequality because such aims benefit pupils with similar experiences to the decision-makers. Pupils having other social conditions can not relate the aims to their own experiences, and these aims "will be means to more ulterior ends of others rather than truly their own" (Dewey, 1916/2007, p. 85). This can be understood as the pupils just becoming performers.

All experiences affect the individual and thereby also the conditions for forthcoming experiences. Dewey (1916/2007) describes this as growing. Growing takes place physically, intellectual and morally. Thereby each experience becomes a part of a continuity. However, a basis for education is what takes place here-and-now, to contribute to children's possibilities to grow here-and-now, and simultaneously make them capable to live in a democratic society (Dewey, 1916/2007, 1938/1997). Democracy is basically about interconnections with others and about the common life (Dewey, 1916/2007).

According to Dewey, learning is an individual process but takes place in interaction with the environment, both the physical and social environment. Conditions and social interaction affect which experiences can be had. According to Dewey (1916/2007, 1929/1958), learning is a social action. The meaning of an issue or object is created through a communicative process. In a communicative process, participants direct their focus on a common object, and express their understanding and responds to each other's ideas. Through the communication, a common understanding can be created. Thus, "communication is a condition for consciousness" (Dewey, 1929/1958, p. 187). Dewey describe meaning-making as taking place in between the subject and the object, and in between the participants in the communicative process. Thereby "in between" can be understood as an interaction between entities⁷⁹.

⁷⁹ According to what I can find, Dewey does not formulate an explicit definition of "in between".

Communication takes place through different modes. Dewey (1934/2005) points out that a superior importance is given to speech, but that the art forms contain different modes of communication. For example, in a drama process, multiple modes of communication are used both in the social interaction between participants, and as expressions in the dramatic action (Østern, 2011). Examples of modes in drama are gestures, facial expressions, glances, physical positioning, sounds and words. All modes “conveys what cannot be said in another language and yet remains the same” (Dewey, 1934/2005, p. 110). Dewey describes experiences that involve an artistic expression as aesthetic experiences. In an aesthetic experience, perception, emotion and cognition are integrated in the action. Expression refers to “doing” and perception to “undergoing” (ibid., p. 47). Thereby, learning is considered to take place between doing and undergoing.

Dewey’s idea about the individual growing in interaction with the environment indicates a view of the subject as a stable entity. The reasoning about connections between previous knowledge, knowledge creation here-and-now and direction towards the future tends to imply a certain degree of linearity. This, in turn, might preclude undirected processes that do not have a linear cause-and-effect connection. Such undirected processes might lead to the creation of new knowledge, according to Deleuze (1968/2004), (this thought will be further evolved later in this chapter). Dewey’s focus on the individual as interacting with the environment can be understood as him having an anthropocentric stance. Those factors lead to the conclusion that his educational philosophy is not considered as a sufficient tool for understanding what is done in educational processes in drama. Therefore, a nomadic approach is also used. This implies, among other things, a displacement of focus to the mutual changes that can take place, and to interrelations between human beings and materialities. In this thesis, this implies a displacement of focus but not a shift to a radical anti-anthropocentric stance because I also focus on social interplay (see also the introduction of chapter 3).

A nomadic approach might provide possibilities to catch sight of and explore movements between, the space in-between. The concept “in-between space” is central in the present thesis and for the choice of theoretical approach, and in the following section, this is described.

3.2 In-between space

The concept of in-between space” can be used with various significations. In order to clarify how it is understood here, this definition is juxtaposed with some different approaches in addition to how it has been described by Dewey (see the previous section).

A psychological definition is provided by Winnicott (1971/2005) describing it as a symbolic space in between the subject’s interior, and the environment. Turner (1974) instead focuses on the relations between individuals, and defines in-between space as a delimited passage between a before and an after, a linear process. Bhabha (1994/2005), in turn, represents a view that both the subject and the community take form as continuous processes of the intersection of historical and geopolitical conditions, class, ethnicity, etc. These processes take place in the encounter between differences and contradictions, in a “Third space” (Bhabha, 1994/2005, p. 53). The subjects, as well as the communities, change or recur through negations in the third space. Bhabha (ibid., p. 5) argues that this in-between space “opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy”. The impact of difference is described as a hybridization, which can imply a creation of new identities.

This reasoning about hybridization implies that a change is done as a mix, and it can be understood that components are mixed together as something new. It seems to be about a mix of some “already-constituted” (Massumi, 2002, p. 70) components, but not about an ongoing change in the intra-acting components. Additionally, according to the approaches mentioned above, the focus lies on relations between humans, but not on interrelations between human beings and materialities. Based on this reasoning, I turned to a nomadic approach to the “in-between”, according to which it is considered as ongoing processes of intra-acting participants, humans and not-humans, and where both the participants and the common are changing. It implies a focus on relation, not between participants as stable entities, but on being as relation.

For the in-between as such, is not a middling being but rather the being *of* the middle – the being of a relation. (Massumi, 2002, p. 70)

The philosopher Brian Massumi takes as a point of departure Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988) reasoning about becoming as processes of interconnections. Deleuze and Guattari argue that changes take place as moves in the relation between participating parties. The produced moves do not have a predestined direction, or are about connecting certain points. New points are located but they are temporary.

Deleuze and Guattari (1991/1994) use the conjunction "AND" to describe relation and moves between active parties. They describe the word AND as a tensor. A tensor causes "the last term to react upon the preceding term, back through the entire chain" (Deleuze & Guattari 1980/1988, p. 99). A tensor "assures the variation of the variable by subtracting in each instance the value of the constant" (ibid. p. 99). This use of the language to relate things is referred to as "a 'logic' of AND", by MacLure (2013b, p. 660). AND is a non-hierarchical conjunction, and implies a shift in focus from the surrounding concepts, to the relation and to the movements in-between. The logic of AND is useful here because it can refer to the relation between different components, and where the relation is considered as non-hierarchical.

This approach is considered useful as a thinking tool about which components are active in a learning process in drama, and how these interrelate. This is not to say that the process cannot be experienced as wholeness by the participants: it certainly can. The point here is that to understand the complexity of a drama process and how learning is done, it is not enough to consider which the participants are and what they are doing together. The process of intra-acting needs to be emphasized. These thoughts will be further evolved throughout the thesis.

As mentioned, this definition of the concept of "in-between space" is related to a nomadic approach, and in the following section, this is presented. The reasoning here is inspired mainly by the philosopher Deleuze's and Guattari's, and Braidotti's ideas.

3.3 A nomadic approach

The nomad is used as a "performative image" (Braidotti, 1994, p. 7) for processes of becoming as subject, as mutual interplay with the environment (Braidotti, 1994,

2006; Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988).⁸⁰ The nomad is not permanently resident in the one and same place, but is movable. That is to say, she is moving but not necessarily all the time. The nomad occupies the space in between (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988). The moves can be done in different directions, not as a preconditioned linear way. She can come back, but never to the same since then both the nomad and the place are changed. It is not about an aimless wandering around, but about an ongoing creation of new ways to act and think, and openness for change.

As a performative image, it implies a view of the subject as active and in an ongoing process of becoming in interrelation with the environment. *Becoming* is about “a multiple and constant process of transformation” (Braidotti, 1994, p. 111). According to Deleuze (1968/2004), there is no essential being, that is to say a fixed, unchangeable self. It does not imply that all are free floating. According to Deleuze and Guattari, all is segmented. “Segmentarity is inherent to all strata composing us. Dwelling, getting around, working, playing: life is spatially and socially segmented.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 208). We are segmented in binary, linear and circular ways. (This is further evolved in the next section.)

However, Braidotti (2006) criticizes Deleuze’s reasoning about processes of becoming for taking the man as a point of departure but not consider differences between sexes. She argues that by being born we are already sexed. She describes the subject as simultaneously coherent, carrying with her experiences and memories, and a process of intersecting forces. This process is “made of constant shifts and negotiations of different levels of power and desires” (Braidotti, 2002, p. 75). The subject is described as embedded, embodied, and non-unitary. Embedded implies being involved in diverse contextual “webs of complex interaction, negotiation and transformation with and through other entities” (Braidotti, 2006, p. 154). We act, experience and think as bodies, and thereby the body is a point of departure for our becoming as subjects. The body as acting, experiencing, thinking and interacting with others can be described as the subject is embodied. Braidotti (1994, p. 4) defines embodied as “a point of overlapping between the physical, the symbolic and the sociological”. In the present thesis, Braidotti’s definition of the subject is used.

⁸⁰ Within Nomad philosophy, it does not only concern the human being, but as mentioned in the introduction of present chapter, a radical anti-anthropocentric approach is not applied in this thesis.

Thus, with a Nomad philosophical approach, processes of subjectivities are seen as active, relational doings that are open for different *potentialities*⁸¹, and not as linear, predestinated pathway. They can be understood as interplays of different social and discursive forces that are intersecting. Thereby, it is about multiple becomings. That becoming takes place in interconnection with the social context leads on to the argument that who the subject can be and become, and the creation of the common, are done simultaneously. This approach implies that it is never solely about the subject becoming part of the common (Massumi, 2002).

Becoming can be described as a process of differentiation (Deleuze, 1968/2004). (Deleuze separates *differentiation* that signifies a difference from something, and *differenciation* that signify ongoing displacement, a difference in itself.) This concerns both processes of becoming as subject and the construction of knowledge. Knowledge is not seen as something essential that can be transmitted, but as a situated, relational construction. That knowledge is a situated construction is not the same as it is seen as relative (Braidotti, 2013, Haraway, 1988). As the post-humanist philosopher Donna Haraway (1988) argues, all knowledge is situated, in that knowing takes place in our bodies and with our senses. Thinking is an embodied activity, and so is also for example seeing. We can only see from a partial perspective. Knowledge is seen as partial and located, valid as an objective truth in the specific situation (Haraway, 1988).

3.3.1 Segmentarity and micro-politics

The processes of becoming and the creation of knowledge take place through flows of beliefs and desires, and these flows can be grasped as lines (or segmentarities) (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988). I mentioned above that all is segmented in different ways. According to Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988), we are segmented in binary, circular and linear fashions, and the segmentarity is produced by intensities and desires that create movement lines. Binary segmentarity is about dualistic oppositions, circular segmentarity concerns concentric connections in ever larger

⁸¹ In this thesis, *potentiality* does not signify just inherent potentialities not yet realized. It signifies that the bodies “cooperate with everything else, and that we can never know which possibilities will be created for certain body in a contemporary and future perspective” (Lenz Taguchi, 2010).

circles that refer back to a same center, and linear segmentarity is about procedures or episodes following after each other along a line. The lines can be rigid or supple. For example, the educational system on a national level is segmented in a rigid, linear way in that there are central regulations and control systems that influence all levels. Simultaneously it is segmented in a supple way, in that there can be varied ways how to organize the education. (The reasoning about different lines will be related to learning processes in section 3.3.)

Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988) connect their idea about segmentarity with a reasoning about micro-politics and macro-politics. They argue that all is plied by segmentarities on micro- and macro-levels simultaneously. To continue with the example above, the central regulations concerning education are formulated in the curriculum that then is interpreted and enacted in local practices. The curriculum is a macro-political decision, and the enacting in a local educational setting is a micro-political activity. As Olsson (2008) describes it:

[...] a curriculum for instance is to be seen as a macro-political decision, but when it encounters preschool practices, an enormous creativity is released that completely and continuously transforms and defines the curriculum and its accompanying practices in a reciprocal relationship. (Olsson, 2008, p. 86)

According to Deleuze and Guattari, everything is political, and it is simultaneously a macro-politics and a micro-politics. However, even if politics is considered as both macro and micro, it is the micro-politics that is crucial, “that makes it or breaks it” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 222).

A basic thought in Deleuze and Guattari’s reasoning about *micro-politics* is that social systems are “brought into being by the accumulation or aggregation of desiring machines” (Buchanan, 2008, p. 17). Desiring machines are assemblages of desires, and *desires* are constructed as relations between the subject and an object or phenomenon. The subject’s desire to obtain or to do something specific is due to the particular occasion or context. The social systems do not “precede or pre-exist the population” (ibid., p. 17), but are consolidated of a multitude of flows of desires and active beliefs. This approach also implies a view that there are interconnections

between macro-politics, and processes of subjectivities and the subject's perceptions (Larsson, 2013). Multiple movements on a micro-level contribute to producing macro-processes, and these in turn affect the micro-processes.

This idea about micro-politics has relevance in the present study because local drama educational practices can be seen as spaces of micro-political activities. In chapter 8, it will be connected to Foucault's thoughts about interconnections of the macro- and micro-level of politics, in a discussion about what drama can be within current Swedish compulsory school education.

3.3.2 Assemblages

Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988) term the aggregation of interrelating components as an *assemblage*, or “abstract machine”. In this section, I describe this concept and connect it with some other concepts that are considered as central in this thesis.

All interrelated *components* are considered as active agents. The components are seen as “real distinctions” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972/2016, p. 508)⁸², which implies that they both affect and are affected by the interconnected components, but are not dissolved in the total.

Similar thoughts have been expressed by various thinkers. They have used different terms, for example “apparatus” (Barad, 2007) and “dispositif” (Foucault, 1980). The term “dispositif” is often translated as apparatus in English, and is defined by Foucault as the interplay between discursive and non-discursive elements. In this definition, a distinction is inherent between discursive elements and non-discursive elements, which differs from how the term “apparatus” is used for example by Barad. Barad (2007) describes apparatus as “boundary-making practices” (p. 148) of intra-acting phenomenon and discourses. In this thesis, I use the term assemblage since it connects to the English verb assemble, unlike apparatus which merely signals a noun.

An assemblage is a movement force where intra-actions between different components appear and become visible. The components can be materialities (for

⁸² Here, I refer to the *Appendix* that is included in the Swedish translation of Deleuze and Guattari's book, but which is not included in the English version.

example bodies, objects and space), and conceptions, thoughts, discourses etc. *Materiality* is a wide concept that includes things and environments, nature and animals, and aspects of ourselves (for example physiology and neurology) (Åsberg, et al, 2012). In the present thesis, a delimitation is made in reference to physical components that are active and possible to observe in a drama process (see Fischer-Lichte, 2004/2008).

Mostly just the interrelation between discourses and materialities are included in the reasoning about assemblage, but affects have also been considered (Gunnarsson, 2015). The concept *affect* is here defined as the physical sensation of encounters with different components while *emotion* is the consciously recognized effect of affect (Courtney, 1995; Damasio, 1994; Deleuze, 1970/1988; Massumi, 2002). In this thesis, both the concepts of affect and emotion are used, depending on what is most appropriate for the reasoning.

These thoughts about assemblage can provide a tool to focus and explore interrelations between discourses, materialities and affects. It can be useful to identify certain components in a situation, for example discourse, social interaction, intra-action of bodies, space, lights, used materials, etc. In order to also include the component of fiction, Braidotti's thoughts about imagination and memory are considered as useful.

Braidotti (1994, p. 6) takes a point of departure the "practice of "as-if", which she describes as a strategy of how to use memory and imagination for transformations and changes. She (2006, pp. 163-164) argues that "[...] the mind and body can act as synchronized entities [...] and [...] recollect sensations, traces and experiences even after their immediate activity has subsided. Memory is the key term here. Moreover, the embodied subject is also marked with the capacity to discern similarities and differences between diverse experiences, traces and sensations [...] to draw connections and establish links". This capacity is referred to as imagination. The imagination is seen as necessary for memory, and she describes remembering as "the active reinvention" (ibid., p. 169) and as "creative reworking" (Braidotti, 2013, p. 167). Thus, imagination is about creation but not representation. Braidotti (2013) also stresses that imagination is crucial in the process of transformative becoming. For changes to take place, both imagination and critical thought, are necessary parts.

These thoughts not only concern the past - the present – possible becoming, but can also include symbolic components that are active in drama processes (symbols and ‘aesthetic double’ etc, as well as shared experiences of fictive places, persons and actions, in drama processes. Braidotti (2010) says that the processes of memory-imagination are non-linear, multi-layered and work in all directions, and that the relation lies in the center. “We are in *this* together” (ibid., p. 413, Italics in the original text). Social changes are based on “collective imaginations” (ibid., p. 411). In this reasoning, symbolic elements and shared imaginations are not excluded. However, I argue that these need to be highlighted, be presented more distinctly, when it concerns which components are assembled in a drama process. I suggest that drama processes can be described and explored as non-hierarchical interrelations of discourses – materialities – affects – aesthetic symbols. It implies that aesthetic symbols and the potentially possible (virtual), and the actual (what we actually can perceive and know) can be considered as active components in an assemblage.

The concepts of *actual* and *virtual* derive from Deleuze. The actual is what we already can perceive and know about. The potentially possible is termed the virtual, and is about what not is actualized in the situation but potentially can be. It is not only about unattainable or not yet realized possibilities (Deleuze, 1968/2004, 1995/2001, 2002).

What we call virtual is not something that lacks reality but something that is engaged in a process of actualization following the plane that gives it its particular reality. (Deleuze, 1995/2001, p. 31)

These thoughts support that assemblage can be a useful concept in the analysis of drama and learning, in the present study. This is illustrated with the following quotation concerning moves of interrelated components, and which could be understood as a description of aspects of a drama process:

[This] allows us to replace linearity with a more rhizomatic and dynamic style of thinking. The basic method is that of creative repetitions, i.e. retelling, reconfiguring and revisiting the concept, phenomenon, event, or location from different angles. [...] establish multiple connections and lines

of interaction. [...] the internal return of difference, not of sameness. It is creative mimesis.” (Braidotti, 2010, p. 412)

The suggestion above concerning how to apply the concept of assemblage can be understood as a displacement of its signification. This in turn can be related to Deleuze’s (1968/2004, 1990/1995; Deleuze & Guattari, 1991/1994) reasoning that *concepts* are creations in interconnection with the practice. In the following chapter, this thought is evolved.

3.3.3 Creation of concepts

That the concepts have to be created in interconnection with practice implies that the language cannot be imposed on the world and explain it from above. The language does not contain a given truth. This does not imply that the concept cannot exist before the actual practice, but that the meaning of a concept is constructed as an act in this practice. A concept is considered as an ”object of an encounter, as a here-and-now” (Deleuze, 1968/2004, p. xix). Thinking is seen as a practice that is created through encounters with the world.

Something in the world forces us to think. This something is object not of recognition but of fundamental *encounter*. (Deleuze, 1968/2004, p. 176)

However, that meaning of a concept is modified and re-created in the actual situation does not imply that it can signify anything whatsoever since a concept is simultaneously both relative and absolute (Deleuze & Guattari, 1991/1994). It is relative in that it does not capture an essence of an event, and it is absolute “through the condensation it carries out [...] and the conditions it assigns to the problem” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1991/1994, p. 21). The meaning of a concept is created as a relation between the event and the limitations of the concept.

The concept ongoing work in intra-action with practice, and this implies that a displacement of understanding of both the concept and the practice can take place simultaneously. Thinking and being are working together in the same *plane of immanence*. There is no fundamental principle beyond the empirical world: the immanence has no outside (Deleuze, 1995/2001; Deleuze & Guattari, 1991/1994).

Thought is not set over against the world such that it represents the world: thought is a part of the flux of the world. To think is not to represent life but to transform and act upon life. (Colebrook, 2002, p. xxiv)

The meaning of a concept can be articulated through different communicative modes, not necessarily a verbal. Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988, p. 109) consider different modes as intra-acting in that “[g]esture and things, voices and sounds, are caught up in the same “opera”.

These thoughts about connections between concepts and other components, and about articulations, are further discussed throughout the thesis. They can also be related to the earlier provided reasoning that theory is a practice communicating with other practices (p. 77). The relation between theory and practice is seen as horizontal. In relation to research, this implies that theory and concepts are not imposed on a practice as pre-given explanation models. Instead, theory and concepts are intra-acting with practice. The meaning of concepts is not defined beforehand, but in dialogue with the practice. As Olsson (2008, p. 108-109) proposes, “both the concept (or science and theory) and the practice (or empirical data) need to experiment together so as to awaken something in each other, and bring forward something yet not known”.

That concepts are created in relation with practice can be understood as the view that they are part in a learning process, interconnected with other components. A next step therefore is to discuss what learning processes can be about.

3.4 Learning as act

In the present section, Deleuze’s thoughts about learning are the main reference, and these are put in dialogue with Dewey’s reasoning about education. Deleuze has formulated many thoughts concerning knowledge and learning processes, but does not focus explicitly on formal education. Therefore, Inna Semesky, a researcher within educational philosophy, has proven to be a significant source for the application of Deleuze’s ideas to school education.

Referring to Deleuze's ideas about learning, Semetsky (2010) says as follows:

To learn means to move *together* with a particular *milieu*. (Semetsky, 2010, p. 479)

This has resonance with Dewey's (1934/2005) thought:

To steep ourselves in a subject-matter we have first to plunge into it. (Dewey, 1934/2005, p. 55)

Both these quotations highlight that learning is an active interrelation with the actual activity, phenomenon, or issue that is the object for learning. They also point at that learning not only is a cognitive process but also is a bodily action. This can be related to the earlier presented thought that knowing is a bodily action that includes both sensory experiencing and thinking (p. 8). Deleuze (1990/1995) argues that for moves of knowing to take place an interrelation is required between affects, concepts, and percepts. As has been mentioned (p. 89), affects are the physical sensation that precede the conscious awareness of an emotion. Thus, affect can be seen as pre-conscious. A similar understanding is applied to the concept of *percept*, which is understood as a sensory sensation that precedes the awareness of a sensory experiencing. "*Percept* is a perception in *becoming*." (Semetsky, 2009, p. 448, Italics in the original text.) The sensory sensation can be visual, auditory, haptic⁸³, or related to olfaction. Thus, affects and percepts precede consciousness, and concepts are created in an experiential process, as the thought expression of the action.

Moves of learning come about through *desire*. Desire can be understood as a productive force (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972/2004, 1980/1988). Desire is always assembled, related with something in the world, and this produces affects and percepts. Thus, it is not something the subject has, as for example a psychic lack or need. As Smith (2007, p. 74) points out, "it does not refer to my conscious desires [...] but rather to the state of the unconscious drives".

The engagement in something is to be in the middle of it, to be interested. The word "interested" derives from the Latin *interesse* that signifies to be between⁸⁴.

⁸³ The concept *haptic* is discussed in section 3.4.

⁸⁴ See for example Ahlberg, A. W., Lundqvist, N. & Sörblom, G. (1966). *Latinsk-svensk ordbok*. [Latin-Swedish dictionary.] Stockholm: Svenska Bokförlaget/Bonniers.

Related to the thoughts presented above it seems that interest is created by the assemblage of desire and a phenomenon, which in turn has produced affects and percepts. Dewey (1916/2007) describes interest as act in –between the learning subject and the object to learn. *Engagement* can be understood as a participation with active interest, and as an openness for changes and to be affected, and thereby engagement is a prerequisite for learning to take place.⁸⁵

That learning takes place together with the *milieu* implies that it is an action taking place as an interrelation in-between. According to Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988) reasoning, the experiences are the *milieu* where subjects and knowledge are constructed. In the notes of the English translation of the above referred book, the translator Brian Massumi says that the French word *milieu* “means “surroundings”, “medium” (as in chemistry), and “middle”. In the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari, “milieu” should be read as a technical term combining all three meanings.” (Massumi in Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. xvii.) This definition of experience differs from Dewey's (1916/2007, 1934/2005) view that an experience is something that the individual has. However, their views converge in that learning requires experiences, and thereby they can together contribute to understanding learning as practice.

Deleuze (1968/2004) exemplifies his reasoning about learning with someone who learns to swim:

The movements of the swimmer does not resemble that of the wave, in particular, the movements of the swimming instructor which we reproduce on the sand bear no relation to the movement of the wave, which we learn to deal with only by grasping the former in practice. (Deleuze, 1968/2004, p. 25)

The encounter between the swimmer's body and the water affects the body's possibilities to swim, and this produces sensations of affects. This example also illustrates that learning can be a repetition, but a repetition not of the same, but of difference. The swimmer applies the movements in relation to the waves, etc. In line

⁸⁵ The term *engagement* is used in this thesis in relation to discussion about learning processes in drama, and also in relation to production and analysis of data. The latter is evolved in section 4.2.1.

with Deleuze's reasoning, a repetition that leads to new knowing is not a mere copy, but a creative (re-)construction. To learn something new always contains a creative component. It is not about a difference from something else, but a displacement created as a relational doing between, in this case, the swimmer and the wave.

An example from drama is how acting in role can contribute to an understanding from different perspectives. The experience in the in-between space of the actual context and the acting in role in the fictive context can imply a learning that is simultaneously sensory, affective, and cognitive.

Learning is not seen as a transition from one point to a pre-given other point, but as an ongoing displacement. When we realize that we understand in a new or other way, the learning process has already taken place. Movements are not about connecting certain points. New points are located but they are temporary. The focus lies on processes whose directions are not predictable. Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988, p. 2013) describe these movements as rhizomatic lines or flows which "coexist and cross over into each other". The term *rhizome* derives from Biology, and signifies a root system of plants that send out roots and shoots in different directions, and where there is no central stem. As a performative image *rhizome* signifies processes that do not move between fixed or predefined points, and where new and unpredictable connections can be created. The interrelations are temporal, and the components can be of different kinds. As Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988, p. 21) say: "the rhizome connects any point with any other point, and its traits are not necessarily linked to traits of the same nature". In the example above the swimmer and the water are separate entities, and they and the movements between them form a rhizome, and the rhizome is temporal and in constant movement.

This is how segmentarity works in processes of learning. The movement lines can be rigid or supple. Rigid lines can for example be about more of the same, or that things are the one way *or* the other. Supple lines can be about variation and multiplicity. As Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988, p. 215) point out, it is necessarily not that "a little suppleness is enough to make things "better". One example of danger is that it falls back into more of the same. There is also a third kind of line, the line of flight. There are always somethings that elude or escape the segmentary process, and produce lines of flights. These break away from the predefined, and open up the new and different. Thereby, new ways to act and think might be created.

It can be about “magic moments where there seems to be something entirely new and different coming about” (Olsson, 2008, p. 72).

3.4.1 Learning as inquiry and a collective process

Deleuze (1968/2004) refers in his discussion about thinking and learning to the learning paradox. The idea about the learning paradox is formulated by Plato in his work *Meno*⁸⁶. There is a dialogue between Socrates and Meno where it is said that there is no need to inquire about what one already knows, and it is not possible to inquire about what one does not know about since one cannot know about what to inquire. In *Meno*, Socrates’ solution is that knowledge is about recollection, and that the soul already has this knowledge.

As Deleuze points out, this implies an idea about thinking as superior to senses and affects. What the truth can be is then determined by a thinking “I”, and this is related to the Cartesian “I think”. According to Deleuze this would be to reproduce what already is known, in other words, a going in circles back to sameness. He describes it as “the eternal return as the repetition of that of which it is said” (Deleuze, 1968/2004, p. 51). Deleuze terms it as orthodox thought, and lays out postulates related to this. One example is the postulate of representation, which is to say that there is “a single centre, a unique and receding perspective” (ibid., p. 67). Another is the postulate of error, which implies that there is a given measure for what is wrong thinking. Yet another example is the postulate of the result of knowledge, that the process of learning is subordinated to the achieved results. Deleuze argues that this implies “thought without image” (ibid., p. 346), in that it is about sameness but no creative element. And “[to] think is to create – there is no other creation – but to create is first of all to engender “thinking” in thought” (ibid., p. 185).

Orthodox thought does not open up for the potential possible to become, for the creation of what yet not is, or in other words, *the not-yet-known*. The latter expression is not explicitly used in Deleuze’s or Deleuze’s and Guattari’s texts, but is mentioned by Johansson (2015). Deleuze points out an alternative way out of the learning paradox in that he introduces the idea about construction of problem and

⁸⁶ Plato. *Meno*. (B. Jowett, Trans.) The Internet Classics Archives.
<http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/meno.html>. (Downloaded 12th August 2017)

unconditioned experimentation. It is not about a problem that is already defined and has to be solved, for example an obstacle to be overcome. Nor is it a problem that has a solution and is given to someone so she can figure out the right answer. Instead, it is about the construction of a problem, evoked by, for example, wondering or perplexity in relation to a phenomenon.

Referring back to the example above with the subject who learns to swim, the relation between the swimmer's body and movements, the movements of the waves, and the idea about what it be about to swim, together form a problematic field (Deleuze, 1968/2004). According to Deleuze, the idea about swimming is pre-personal, and constitutes a singularity that is not related to the swimmer (the subject), or the water (the object). The problem is determined by this singular point. "A problem is determined by the singular point which express its conditions" (Deleuze, 1969/2004, p. 64). These singular points are events, and are not related to specific persons or propositions. The singular points are connected with other points, and thereby the constructed problem can be seen as one aspect, or concretization of a phenomenon or issue. Related to education, it can be about knowledge content that consists of several problems, and the focus for attention in an educational occasion is the construction of one of these problems (Olsson, 2008).

Thus, to learn is to enter into a problematic field. It is about asking questions about the problem, and about experimentation with it. The construction of a problem and questions, and the exploration of the problem implies a process of learning in that it includes exploration in the practice of how to do, of different point of views, and the creation of ideas about potential ways to solve or handle it. It is unconditioned experimentation because there is no correlation to a given solution. The meaning is created in the process. "Sense is located in the problem itself. Sense is constituted in the complex theme" (Deleuze, 1968/2004, p. 196). The tentative experimentation of potential possible ways to handle the problem might lead to creation of new knowledge.

To think is to experiment, but experimentation is always that which is in the process of coming about – the new, remarkable, and interesting that replace the appearance of truth and are more demanding than it is. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1991/1994, p. 111)

This reasoning has similarities with Dewey's (1938/1991, 1938/1997) thoughts about learning as inquiry. He argues that a problem stimulates the thinking, and that an experience here-and-now has to be related to something unknown in order to be problematic.

[...] all reflection sets out from the problematic and confused. (Dewey, 1929/1958, p. 65)

[The problem has to be] such that it arouses in the learner an active quest for information and for production of new ideas. The new facts and the new ideas thus obtained become the ground for further experiences in which new problems are presented. (Dewey, 1938, p. 79)

Dewey, like Deleuze, argues that a problem is connected with an active inquiry and creation of ideas about how to understand it. A common feature is also that the solution of a problem is not seen as a final goal, but that it gives rise to new problems. This reasoning implies that *how* we learn and *what* we learn are seen as interconnected. According to Deleuze, it opens up for the unpredictable, *the not-yet-known*. Another difference between Dewey and Deleuze is that while Dewey locates the problem inside the learner, Deleuze (1968/2004) instead defines it as movement in-between, and thus it is always both an exterior and interior action. The learning process is embodied, and done in relation with a phenomenon.

However, both Deleuze and Dewey see the construction of knowledge as a collective process. Dewey (1916/2007) argues that creation of knowledge as a social process where the participants' different experiences are connected. This takes place as communication. This view relates to the Nomad Philosophical idea about knowledge as a collective construction (Guattari, 1992/1995; Olsson, 2008). The term *collective* is not understood as individuals that are coming together and form a group, that is to say that the individuals precede the common. Instead *collective* "should be understood in the sense of a multiplicity that deploys itself as much beyond the individual, on the one side of the socius, as before the person, on the side of preverbal intensities" (Guattari, 1992/1995, p. 9). Knowledge can be seen as a

relational and contextual construction that is done in collective process where simultaneously the subjects and the common are created.

From this, it follows that learning can be seen as a collective process. Collective learning can be described as a learning process where the participant share a common situation, have about the same preconditions, and that the situation has “[...] such a common and emotive character that of all participants mobilize the mental energy required for a [...] learning, concerning the common in the situation” (Illeris, 2015, p. 151)⁸⁷. Collective learning includes reflection together about the common experience, and a common creation of new knowledge. It “[...] requires that learners develop a shared understanding and meaning [...] and that new knowledge is developed as a result of this” (Gubbins & MacCurtain, 2008, p. 580). In collective learning processes, the production of knowledge and social interaction are interconnected components. The individuals’ skills and experiences contribute to a learning process connected to a common activity, and simultaneously the common process contributes to the subject’s knowing. Thus, collective learning processes involve learning on both group level and individual level.

The interconnection of interior and exterior, and individual and collective leads on to the suggestion that it is a non-dichotomous approach to education. This thought relates to Deleuze’s (1995/2005) and Deleuze & Guattari’s (1991/1994, 1980/1988) idea that substantial elements co-exist on the same immanent plane. As Massumi (2002) points out, [t]he field of immanence is not the elements in mixture” (p. 76).⁸⁸

3.4.2 Space for learning

The reasoning above cannot be separated from learning’s *where*. Learning processes always take place somewhere, in a space. Space is defined here as *both* a physical place, and as an actualization of social actions in time and space (Gordon, Holland & Lahelma, 2000). This thesis is about drama education within compulsory schooling, and this education takes place as events in a material place, a school building. The

⁸⁷ [...] en sådan gemensam och känsloladdad karaktär att den hos samtliga deltagare mobiliserar den psykiska energi som krävs för ett [...] lärande, som berör den gemensamma situationen” (Illeris, 2015, p. 151).]

⁸⁸ Larsson (2013), in his thesis, uses the term in a similar way. He argues that a Deleuzian approach can support “a non-dichotomous thinking in education (p. 21, 68).

design of the building and the rooms has significance for how the education can be staged. In the following, this thought is evolved on the basis of Deleuze's and Foucault's ideas. These ideas are connected with thoughts formulated by the architect and researcher Inge Mette Kirkeby regarding interconnections between pedagogy and physical space.

In the second part of this section, the signification of space as actualization of social actions in time and space is discussed by using the concept of *event*.

A point of departure for the thought about the significance of the design of the physical place is the criticism of a dichotomous thinking that has been highlighted earlier in this thesis (section 1.1.1). The dichotomy between different subject fields is mentioned, but this is also connected with a dichotomy between body and mind, and between body and physical space. In line with Dewey's (1916/2007, 1929/1958) and Deleuze's (1968/2004) reasoning, it is argued that we experience as bodies, and therefore the dichotomy between the human body and the mind, and between human beings and the environment is questioned. Instead, learning is understood as a bodily act in interplay with the physical space. The design of the buildings and room has significance for how education can be staged, and thereby, also for which forms of knowledge are given significance. As Foucault (1975/1991) says, the construction of institutions, for example schools, is related to which activity can be realized and to control and regulation of behavior. The disciplinary technologies that have been touched upon in section 2.2 in relation to the division of activities and subjects in education also include the division of activities and pupils in physical spaces. This enables control and the regulation towards desired conduct in accordance with implicit and explicit rules.

It is spaces that provide fixed positions and permit circulation; they carve out individual segments and establish operational links; they mark places and indicate values; they guarantee the obedience of individuals, but also a better economy of time and gesture. (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 148)

What is made possible to do in a space is also related to explicit or implicit rules for how to conduct. It can for example be about the idea that an empty floor space tells a child to run, but the rule is that everyone should go into the room calmly and quietly.

The thought about the regulation of behavior can be related to Foucault's (1975/1991, 1980) ideas about power and conformity to prevailing norms. The individual's desire to conform lead to an interior control of behavior. This includes a control of the body and the voice. Foucault (1980, p. 57) argues that "[i]n fact nothing is more material, physical, corporeal than the exercise of power". In Western schools, there is a dominating discourse concerning how to behave as a good pupil that includes knowing when to be silent and use restricted corporeal movements (Lofors-Nyblom, 2009; Rose, 1996). However, in concrete educational settings, different discursive and non-discursive practices are active, and might pull in different directions (Foucault, 1976/1990). For example, what is regarded as desirable in drama education might differ from what is acceptable in education in other academic subjects. (See also Ball, Maguire & Braun, 2012). This, in turn, may affect what is possible to do in a physical space.

Another point of departure for the thoughts presented here about the significance of the physical place is the architect Kirkeby's (2006) research study about the interplay between school buildings and the activities taking place there. She highlights that the design of a physical space contributes to possibilities for social interaction, to the regulation of behavior, and to which activities are made possible.

The physical space as an *activity space* refers to how the design of a room can delimit or open up for activities. A space with furniture and equipment for specific activities, as for example a room for Crafts, is a space with high coded functionality, according to Kirkeby (2006). Then the furniture and equipment allows for certain activities. This can be connected to the regulation of behavior, in line with Foucault's thoughts about disciplinary technologies. In schools, different rooms are often designed for different activities. There is for example a gymnasium for Physical education, rooms for Crafts, and classrooms with tables and chairs for theoretical subjects. This organization can be seen as a maintenance of a dichotomy between theoretical and practical subjects. Theoretical subjects are connected with placement on chairs and with a table, and that in turn does not promote physically moving activities.

In drama, the intra-action between the body and the physical space is central for both the experiencing and the expression. The physical actions include, among other things, physical awareness, focusing, and movements. (See Ahlstrand, 2014; Boal,

1974/2000; Franks, 1996, 2015a). However, because Drama is not a compulsory subject in the Swedish national curriculum, there is seldom offered a special drama room. As Fredriksson (2013, p. 67)⁸⁹ points out, there are schools where teachers, in order to use drama, “constantly have to change rooms and move away school benches to free a working space”. She concludes that the extra work to prepare the working space each time might contribute to that drama not either is used often as a resource in education within other subjects.

A space that can easily be changed and adapted for different activities has a smooth functionality (Kirkeby, 2006). In this thesis the term activity space is used in connection with Deleuze and Guattari’s (1980/1988) concepts of *smooth spaces* and *striated spaces*. These refer to both the physical spaces and the activities done there. Smooth spaces open up for changes and variation, while striated spaces are predefined and regulated. This includes the possible ways to use both the room and the objects. Object that can easily be used in different ways and be given different symbolic meaning contribute to a smooth functionality.

The bodily interaction with space and objects involves the sense of touch, and so can the visual and auditory senses. This interaction can be termed *haptic* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988). An encounter with something in the world is sensed and affects us, which makes us think, that is to say, the encounter is a haptic space (Deleuze, 1968/2004; Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988). As Gunnarsson (2015, p. 80) points out, haptic implies “a combination of affect, perception and action”⁹⁰. A usual definition of the concept *haptic* is that it signifies the possibilities of something to be perceived tactually, in contrast to optically (the Swedish word *haptisk* is explained so in *Nationalencyclopedia* (1992), but Deleuze and Guattari extend the concept *haptic* to include the tactile, visual and auditory. They argue that vision and auditory also fulfill a tactile function. A concrete example of what this implies is provided by Massumi (2002, p. 157-158): “We can see texture. You don’t have to touch velvet to know that it is soft, or a rock to know that it is hard [...but] [y]ou have to know texture in general already before you can see a specific new texture.” A haptic space is considered as a combination of the tactile and other senses, and actions.

⁸⁹ [”ständigt får byta lokal och flytta undan bänkar för att frigöra en arbetsyta” Fredriksson, 2013, p. 67)]

⁹⁰ [“en kombination av känsla, perception och handling” (p. 80)]

We can leave the physical place but bring experiences from an actual event with us as memories. The concept of *event* derives from Deleuze (1969/2004, p. 64), who uses it as a description of an encounter of involved agents, “[...] its spatial-temporal realization in a state of affairs”. *Event* does not signify a passage between a ‘before’ and a ‘after’, a delimited situation. This implies for example that when memories from earlier experiences are used in order to create meaning about an actual problem, the event is connected with earlier events related to these memories. Various assemblages take form and contribute to the production of different movements, in one and the same event. The focus on a problem can take place as a common activity in a class at the same time as some peers making friends again after a conflict during the previous break, and at the same time the wind blows in through an open window and plays with someone’s hair, and distracts her for a moment, and so on.⁹¹

Thus, event cannot be reduced to an episode, but is about the ongoing and relational ‘here-and-now’. This concurs with Foucault’s (1991) description of events as constituted of relational processes of different components, and that the components that constitute these processes are not delimited to one singular event. The interrelated elements can be of various kinds, “the said as much as the unsaid” (Foucault, 1980, p. 194). Foucault (1991, p. 76) suggests *eventalization* as a conceptual tool to make visible “the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies and so on”, that are active in a singular event. This thought is relevant here because it highlights an event as constituted of multiple processes, or in other words, that multiple, temporal assemblages take place simultaneously.

Deleuze’s (1969/2004) and Foucault’s (1980) reasoning converge also in that doings and language are considered as interconnected in an event, and that the event is expressible. This is developed by Deleuze (1969/2004, p. 16) as follows: “It is the characteristic of events to be expressed or expressible”. If the language is used to merely comment, interpret or point out conditions for truth to come about, the event

⁹¹ This definition of the concept *event* has similarities with, but is not the same as Ficher-Lichte’s (2004/2008) reasoning about performances as event. Similarities are the view that an event is about interrelations between the real and the fictive context, between actors and spectators, and between subject and object, and that it can imply a transformative process. However, Ficher-Lichte (ibid. p. 174) connects her reasoning about event with Turners ideas about liminality. This is to say that an event is defined as a delimited experience between a before and an after, and this differs from the definition applied in present thesis.

is closed down. If instead truth is treated as an (unconditioned) effect of the production of meaning, the event is kept open.

The concept of event is discussed and explored in relation to drama educational practices throughout this thesis.

4. Mapping as method

A central principle for a post-constructionist approach is that choices of methods are made in the actual research project, and are based on the interests that are at stake (Lykke, 2009/2010). This implies that there is no formulated model applicable for all research studies. In the present study, the research object concerns what drama can be within the current compulsory school system in Sweden, how learning takes place in drama, and which components contribute to these learning processes. One research question is about participating pupils' articulations of drama, and of learning in drama. This requires a use of methods to construct and analyze data that make possible an enquiry of processes and the interplays of different components that mutually affect each other in learning processes in drama education.

On the basis on this, in the study I use nomadic mapping (cartography) as a method, inspired by Braidotti (2002, 2010), and Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988). Mapping is about revisiting the same issue from different perspectives. It can also be about going between different sites to map connections, variations and change. To follow of a line of flight can lead to "far away" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988 p. 11), and this can imply sites of different kinds since the interrelated traits can be of a different nature. As Braidotti (2002) points out, this can include going between different discourses. It is a convergence with Foucault's (1991) genealogy in that he argues that a practice is an effect of multiple processes, and that "[...] the further one breaks down the processes under analysis, the more one is enabled and indeed obliged to construct their external relations of intelligibility" (Foucault, 1991, p. 77).

My interventions and engagement during the research process imply movements between theory and practice, and between different sites. An empirical study is carried out in order to explore practices of drama education within Swedish compulsory school. Data are constructed through observations and interviews in existing, local drama educational practices, and these data are thereafter analyzed, and the study is presented in the form of a text. Therefore, it is considered as an ethnographic study (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

Taken a nomadic approach, a point of departure is that responsibility is considered as an inherent part of all our doings: it is an ethical practice (Barad, 2007, Braidotti,

2006). We are situated in this world, and responsibility is not something we can choose or not: we are always already responsible (Barad, 2007). Ethical responsibility is intertwined with knowing and being “[...] since each intra-action matters, since the possibilities for what the world may become call out in the pause that precedes each breath before a moment comes into being and the world is remade again, because the becoming of the world is a deeply ethical matter” (ibid., p. 145). It follows that all actions have to be connected with ongoing ethical reflections and considerations. In the present study, this approach is interwoven with research ethical considerations. Research ethics is seen as “an active ongoing action” (Gunnarsson, 2015, p. 76)⁹², and is included in all parts of the research process. In this chapter, the research ethical considerations related to the construction of data are included in the reasoning. In addition to this, research ethical aspects are also highlighted in a separate section (4.4).

In the following, I describe the design of the research study and the considerations contributing to my choices. I also present the schools participating in the empirical study. Thereafter, I provide a description of the methods used to produce and analyze data in the empirical study.

4.1 Multiple sites

As mentioned above, I move back and forth between empirical data and theory. These movements also include school policy documents, pedagogical texts and texts about drama, including previous research. Taken together school policy, policy documents, different local practices of drama education in school, theory, previous research, methodology and methods are interrelated components in the research assemblage formed in this study. All these components are active agents in the creation of knowledge about drama in school.

Thus, the research assemblage includes local practices of drama education in compulsory schools, and discourses concerning drama and education, and school policy on a national level. These practices are seen as different sites for drama

⁹² [”[...] en aktivt pågående handling” (Gunnarsson, 2015, p. 76).]

educational practices. *Site* is understood here as a location in both space and time (Braidotti, 2006, 2013, Haraway, 1988). An intention is to enquire which learning processes are made possible in drama educational practices and interconnections of components that contribute to this. Instead of staying for a long time in one single place, I follow and engage with the research object across multiple sites. Thereby, my focus is not on a comparison between separate cases, which in this study should have been a comparison between the different local practices of drama education that are participating in the empirical study.

In order to analyze dominant discursive formations, a genealogical analysis has been undertaken, which has a focus on pedagogical and aesthetic trends, and on educational policy. This genealogical analysis is placed earlier in this thesis to provide a background and contextualization of drama in the Swedish compulsory school system (chapter 2).

There is a convergence between the methodological approach applied for the empirical study and Foucault's genealogy in that the focus lies on relations, changes and discontinuities, and on cartographic mapping (Braidotti, 2002; Foucault, 1969/1972, 1991). However, while genealogical tracing refers back to what can historically have led to changes, a cartographic mapping refers to actual and temporal interconnections that produce changes. Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988, p. 12) argue that a "map has multiple entryways, as opposed to the tracing, which always comes back "to the same". Looking back on a process one can trace a move, but the focus for mapping lies on the movement. Thus, "*the tracing should always be put back on the map*" (ibid., p. 13, Italics in the original texts). Following this reasoning, in the present thesis *tracing* is used when referring to the genealogical analysis, and *mapping* referring to analysis of data from the empirical study.

In order to explore how drama is practiced in concrete educational settings, in Swedish compulsory school, I as the researcher follow different school classes during drama education. The participating schools, and the criteria for selection of these, are presented in the following section.

4.1.1 Participating schools in the empirical study

In the empirical study, school classes from different schools participate, with different ways to organize drama education. These are seen as examples of what drama in school can be about depending on specific contextual factors.

In Swedish schools, drama is mostly offered as a temporary part of education. But there are a smaller number of schools where drama is used recurrently, even if the organization of how it is used differs. The Education Act (*SFS 2010:800*) states that in addition to the compulsory subjects, education should comprise “the pupil’s choice” and “the school’s choice”⁹³. A point of departure in the search for schools to participate in the present study is to include schools where drama is offered recurrently during a coherent period of some months or a longer time.

Thereby it was possible for me as a researcher to follow drama educational processes over time. This criterion was based on my experiences as a professional drama pedagogue that the time factor has an impact on the possibilities for learning in drama. This implies time to learn different drama methods and techniques, and to apply these in practice. Another criterion for the selection is that drama was taught by a drama specialist⁹⁴, and this is related to the quality of drama teaching. A third criterion was to include school classes from the latter part of compulsory schooling, and the reason for this is that participants presumably have the verbal capacity to express perceptions about different aspects of drama and learning. Another reason is that it would be possible to draw parallels that might prove illuminating between drama education in Swedish compulsory school and in English secondary school. In England drama is an included component in the subject of English in secondary school (Department of Education, 2014).

As mentioned in the genealogical analysis, major changes were initiated within the educational field in Sweden in 2011, and I started the present research project during

⁹³ The Education Act states that “[e]ducation in the pupil’s own choice shall aim to widen and deepen pupils knowledge in one or more subjects. The school’s own choice may include a local option, if the Swedish National Agency for Education has approved a plan for education”. (*SFS 2010:800*, 10 chapter, § 4.) [“Undervisningen i elevens val ska syfta till att bredda och fördjupa elevers kunskaper i ett eller flera ämnen. Skolans val får omfatta ett lokalt tillval, om Skolverket har godkänt en plan för undervisningen.” (*SFS 2010:800*, 10 kapitlet, §4.)

⁹⁴ Drama teacher means here a teacher who has an education as drama pedagogue, which is a drama pedagogue authorized by RAD (National organization for Authorized Drama pedagogues) or has a solid drama education from university. In the following, I alternately use the terms “drama pedagogue” or “drama teacher” when I refer to a drama specialist.

the same year. These changes contribute to a fragmented and marginalized practice of drama in many schools, and this affected my possibilities to find schools to ask for participation in the study. For example, one school earlier offered drama education as a scheduled subject, but from 2011 did not do so anymore, and the employed drama teachers decided to leave this school. Another example was that drama teachers when taking leave for a longer period were not replaced during this period. The search for participants ended up as a minor mapping of the situation for drama education in Swedish schools after the school reforms, and this in turn was a support in the analysis of the conditions for drama in Swedish school today (chapter 2).

Three schools participated in the present empirical study. Based on the possibilities to offer a local school choice and the local decision makers' perception that drama can contribute with a valuable way of knowing and form of expression, drama is offered as scheduled subject at some point over time. The schools are called Aspskolan, Tallenskolan and Cypresskolan. These are fictive names, chosen to prevent identification of the schools. From these schools, four classes, grades 5-8 (pupils between the ages of 11 and 14), participated (81 pupils and three drama teachers in total). In the following section, the participants are presented briefly, and this presentation is based on interviews with the drama teachers in the schools, and on written information (the school's web sites and local documents).

Aspskolan

Aspskolan is a municipal school from preschool class up to grade 9⁹⁵ (pupils between the ages 6 and 15), situated in the central part of a big town. Regular education in drama is offered for all pupils as one of the school's specific profiles. Time for Drama as a subject is used from teaching time for the school's own choice. One drama pedagogue is employed, and who teaches Drama in grades 3-7 as a scheduled subject. In school year 8, the pupils can choose Drama as the pupil's own choice. Beside this are teachers for preschool classes and grades 1-2 teaching their pupils in

⁹⁵ As mentioned earlier in this thesis, the compulsory school in Sweden embraces grades 1-9. Compulsory school starts the year the child reach seven years of age. In grades 1-5 or 1-6, a class teacher teaches the majority of subjects in the class. Some subjects (for example Art, Crafts, Music, and Physical education and health) are often taught by subject educated teachers. In grades 7-9 or 6-9, teaching in all subjects is conducted by subject educated teachers. In the cases schools offer education for preschool class up to grades 5 or 6, the children thereafter move on to another school.

Drama, with support and tutorial from the drama teacher. Some teachers in other subjects are integrating drama as a method in their education, and the drama teacher has a mission to support and give tutorials for them too. The school has a local syllabus for drama, from grade 6 and upward. There, it is formulated that Drama is an art subject with a basis in theatre. It is also said that “[a] central part of the education is about to actively use and develop one’s imagination, creativity, spontaneity and empathy” (Local syllabus, Aspskolan)⁹⁶.

From school year 6, a large number of pupils come from other schools. That actual year, the number of school classes increased from one to three. The pupils that had been one school class up to grade 5 were now mixed with the others. This led, among other things, to a third of the pupils in the classes having had experience of Drama as a subject, while the others mostly had not. I follow the drama education in one of these new class constellations, and one of the classes in grade 6 was randomly selected. Drama was organized as half class education, one group every week during the autumn term, and one group during the spring. The drama lessons are 60 minutes once a week, and take place in a drama room. The school year started with an introduction week, where Drama was included a half day per class.

I followed one class 6 from their drama introduction the first week and during drama education for one whole school year 2013/2014. On one occasion, I visited science education offered for the whole class, when the science teacher used drama as method.

Cypresskolan

Cypresskolan is a municipal school, from preschool class up to grade 5, situated in an area with mixed dwellings, a few kilometres from the central part of a bigger town. Drama is offered as a scheduled subject in grades 4 and 5. Time for Drama is used from the school’s own choice, and as an integration with different subjects, especially Swedish and Visual arts. Drama is presented as a subject that gives possibilities to express one self, to express opinions and thoughts, and to perform role-plays etc. According to information on the school’s website, Drama can contribute to self-esteem, the development of language, problem-solving, and imagination. A drama pedagogue is employed, who has Drama and Visual arts as

⁹⁶ “En central del av undervisningen handlar om att aktivt använda och utveckla sin fantasi, kreativitet och inlevelseförmåga” (Lokal kursplan, Aspskolan).

subjects. Sometimes, the drama teacher collaborates with the class teachers around different subjects, for example Civics or Swedish, and sometimes with the Craft teacher. Parts of drama education that are connected with goals for a compulsory school subject, have a formulated plan with connections to the curriculum, content and criteria for assessment⁹⁷.

Drama education is scheduled three coherent lessons (in total 135 minutes) every week, and takes place in a drama room. School year 5 was selected for the empirical study since the pupils have experiences of Drama from the previous year. During the first part of this actual year, the groups were mixed with half of the pupils from each of the two classes. Both groups were followed, and this made it possible to easily go on with the study when a reorganisation was made after half a school term and the school classes had drama education separately. I followed the classes from the beginning of autumn term 2014 until the end of February 2015.

Tallenskolan

Tallenskolan is a municipal school from preschool class up to grade 9, situated in a municipality in a metropolitan region. The school has a culture profile, which implies that all pupils have one lesson per week in different aesthetic expressions, during school years 1-5. In year 6, it is possible to choose Drama as the pupil's own choice, and then the education has a focus on puppetry. In school years 7-9, it is possible to select a drama profile. The formulated idea behind the possibility to choose a profile is that pupils' motivation to study can thereby be stimulated. It is possible for other young people from the region to apply to drama class in Tallenskolan. There is one separate drama class for each school year. The focus in drama education lies on theatre as an art form, and includes various theatrical tools and collaborative processes. There are some connections with the subject of Swedish. A drama pedagogue is employed at the school, who teaches Drama and Crafts.

The Drama classes have Drama scheduled two separated lessons (50 minutes each) every week, and beside this there can be collaboration between Drama and other subjects. The physical basis for the education is a drama room. The time for Drama as a subject is partially taken from time for the pupil's own choice, and partially from

⁹⁷ In Swedish compulsory school, formal grades are given from school year 6. During earlier school years an individual development plan (in Swedish: individuell utvecklingsplan (IUP) is written. This includes a review and plan for further action.

the school's own choice. During the school years 7 and 8, the drama education has a connection with the subject of Swedish, in that a literary genre and writing a script are included in the work with a theatre play from idea to performance. Collaboration with other subjects is also realized.

I followed one drama class from the beginning of the spring term in school year 7, until the end of February 2015, in their school year 8.

The first contact with the schools was taken via email to the headmasters, and comprised information about the research project and a request about their interest for participation. Information was given about why the request was sent to this specific school. If there was an interest in participation, I contacted the drama teacher via email, with information and a request for participation. In dialogue with interested drama teachers, I decided which school class in each school should be offered the possibility to participate in the study. These choices were based on formulated purposes for drama education for different school years and on time schedules, and thereby no specific groups were selected beforehand. The drama teachers then gave the class information and asked the pupils if they would like to participate in the study. They were informed about that the focus being on drama education, and not on separate individuals. If the classes wanted to participate, they and their legal guardians received an information letter from me about the purpose and arrangement of the research study and an *Informed consent form* with request for participation in interviews, and in the documentation of drama education in form of video-recording and photography. The information sheets and consent forms were formulated in accordance with British guidelines (BERA, 2011), and slightly adapted to the Swedish context. Each drama teacher also filled in an *Informed consent form* concerning the video-recording and photography of educational situations in drama, and participation in an interview about background and purposes for drama education. In the three participating schools there was one pupil that was not allowed to participate in interview, video or photo. Five pupils' signed forms were not received, and therefore they did not participate in interviews, and were not video-recorded or photographed.

4.1.2 Compilation of data material in the empirical study

The empirical study was undertaken during the period August 2013 - February 2015. Three schools, four classes, and in total 81 pupils participated. (In Aspskolan, 26 pupils participated, in Tallenskolan 22 pupils, and in Cypresskolan 17 + 16 pupils.)

Table 1: Compilation of research interventions

	Observation (video recorded in brackets)	Interview I (total number in brackets)	Interview II (total number in brackets)	Interview drama teacher
Aspskolan one class, grade 6 whole school year 2013/2014, half the class each term	7 observations during the autumn term and 8 in spring. (2 in both groups, in total 4) In addition 2 observations in whole class. In total 17 observations.	1 October 2013 and 11 February 2014 (14 interviews with 1-3 informants)	3 December 2013 and 27 May 2014. (4 group interviews)	27 November 2013
Tallenskolan One class January 2014, in grade 7, to February 2015, in grade 8	In total 16 observations. (2)	The period 6 February 2014 – March 2015 (9 interviews, 1-3 participants)	27 March 2015 (1 group interview)	24 October 2014
Cypresskolan Two classes in Cypresskolan, grade 5, from August 2014 to February 2015.	7 observations in both classes. (3 in both classes)	The period 14 October 2014 – 27 January 2015 (15 individual interviews)	March 2014 (7 group interviews)	18 November 2014 and 31 January 2015

The interviews lasted between 14 minutes and just over an hour.

In addition to this, I visited an introduction to drama in Aspskolan. This took place during the first week of the school year. The purpose was to introduce drama and to provide an opportunity for the pupils to get to know each other. The introduction was led by the drama teacher, and it lasted for two hours. I also visited one lesson in science education in Aspskolan, where drama was occasionally used as a method. These were realized in whole class.

In Cypresskolan, I had the opportunity to interview a former pupil. This young person was a pupil there during earlier school years, and once visited the drama education. The visit was announced in advance, whereby I could inform about the research study and acquire consent from both the youth and legal guardian before this occasion. The analysis of this interview is presented together with the other interviews, for confidentiality reasons.

In the following section, I describe my interventions and engagement as researcher in relation to these local drama practices.

4.2 Construction and analysis of data

As a researcher, I am one of the agents in the actual practices: I am “participant in and in compliance with, the analyzed world” (Lykke, 2009/2010, p. 5). The position as researcher implies that I am the subject who intervenes with data construction and analyzes the data. My interventions as researcher affects what takes place, and I am also affected (Gunnarsson, 2015). Thereby, research can be seen as both an ongoing creation of knowledge and an ongoing becoming as a researcher.

In this study, the participation as researcher involves intra-action with other participants, in that I am sharing the situation, but not actively taking part in or leading drama education. I am present together with the participants in the room, observe the activities, am conversing with participants and showing interest for what is taking place in the situation. A purpose for the present study is to explore already existing drama educational practices.

The methods used to construct empirical data were observations and interviews. Here, I use the term “data construction” instead of “data collecting”, since the latter indicates that someone collects from somewhere else, but the previous can include constructions both by the research subject and as co-construction among various agents (see for example Gunnarsson, 2015).

The concrete plan for the realization of the construction of data in each participating school was done by me as researcher in dialogue with the actual drama teacher, so that dates for my visits did not collide with other activities at the school. I

visited the classes during drama lessons one time every second or third week, or every month, depending on whether there were other activities or school holidays. To come back to the classes several times lead to the relation between me and participants changing over time since we got to know each other. Therefore, it was important for me as researcher to continuously reflect on positioning and research strategy (see Haraway, 1988).

4.2.1 Observations

In order to follow and explore practices of drama education in school, observations are used as one method to construct data. The word “observation” is used here even though this signifies to look closely, and thereby includes only the sight, but not other senses. *Observation* can also imply that the researcher goes out “to a well-defined and constant ‘field’ in order to observe what is taken place there” (Gunnarsson, 2015, p. 80)⁹⁸. Since I as researcher in the present study am considered as someone who both affects and is affected in the interrelation with the participants, an alternative would have been to instead use the concept of *engagement* to describe observation as a multisensory method to construct data. On the other hand, a use of the term “engagement” only might be confusing since this has various significations, and therefore the term “observation” is used here.⁹⁹ As mentioned earlier (p. 94) “engagement” is defined as participation with active interest, and openness for changes and to be affected.¹⁰⁰

In this study, the focus for observations is on doings and relationalities, about what takes place in the educational processes. It is a relatively open focus (Fangen, 2004/2005), including aesthetic expressions and symbols, content, interrelations between participants, and between participants and materialities, and then including different communicative modes. This might contribute to a documentation of data

⁹⁸ “[...] till ett väldefinierat och konstant ’fält’ för att iaktta vad som utspelas där [...]” (Gunnarsson, 2015, p. 80).]

⁹⁹ This is not to say that observations do not involve engagement: they certainly do. The researcher’s engagement in connection with observations is highlighted by Fangen (2004/2005).

¹⁰⁰ A multisensory approach can have connection with auto-ethnography (Gunnarsson, 2015, Pink, 2009), but is then often based on a fixed demarcation between the researcher and the research field, together with use of self-reflection as strategy.

that can be analysed based on different questions raised during the research process (Kullberg, 2014).

Observation implies involvement with the participants, and as Fangen (2005) describes, observations involve two activities simultaneously: “You involve yourself in interaction with others, while watching what they are undertaking” (Fangen, 2004/2005, p. 30.)¹⁰¹. Not only watching, but different sensory experiences assist the researcher’s understanding and construction of data (Gunnarsson, 2015; Pink, 2009). As a researcher, I watched, listened and experienced kinaesthetically (with senses) in relation with other agents. As I highlighted in section 3.4, an encounter with something in the world is sensed and affects us, which makes us think, and is understood as a haptic space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988).

In the present study, several senses involved in a specific event are taken into consideration. This implies a multisensory engagement. The concept of *multisensory engagement* derives from the drama practitioner Patrice Baldwin (2012), and is used by her as a strategy for drama in education. Even so, it is relevant to use it here as a term for a methodological approach, since there are similarities between drama and research inquiry^{102, 103}. A multisensory approach is about being attentive to one’s own sensory experiences and about how sensory experiences might be perceived by other participants (Pink, 2009). During the research process, I made written notes about different sensory experiences.

On the days on which I followed drama education in these classes, I spent time at the actual school before or after these lessons, with the purpose of becoming more familiar with the school. The educational events were always followed from start to end. I took part as a “partial participating observer”. In the beginning of an encounter with the pupils, I told if I wanted to document with video or photo, in order to have consent for this particular occasion. During observations, I sat nearby pupils while I

¹⁰¹ [”Du involverar dig i samspel med andra, samtidigt om du iakttar vad de företar sig” (Fangen, 2004/2005, p. 50.)]

¹⁰² Later in this chapter, similarities between drama and qualitative research will be discussed, in connection with description of the use of drama as research methods.

¹⁰³ A multisensory approach is used within art-based research (Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice*. Toronto: University of Michigan.), in social anthropology and cultural studies (Kullberg, 2014; Pink, 2009), and within social semiotic approaches focusing on multimodality (Kress, 2010). For example, Kullberg (2014) mentions that observation includes use of all senses, but that mostly only sight and listening are used.

document. If the class was working in small groups, I stayed with one or several groups, depending on what might be convenient for the pupils. I did not interfere in how they are working with drama (for example, giving ideas or advice), even though I am aware of that my presence was an interference which affects doings. This choice of observation strategy is based on the thought that I as adult cannot participate as one of the pupils (Fangen, 2004/2005).

The documentation of observations was here done as field notes and written notes afterwards, from memory, video recording and photography. These forms were used alternately. The choice to use different forms for documentation is based on the thought that they can contribute to different things appearing from the data. The use of equipment for documentation (note material, video camera and digital camera) affects the encounter, and they are therefore co-constructors of what takes place (Gunnarsson, 2015, Lenz Taguchi, 2010).

Thus, I as researcher used different ways to intra-act with equipment for documentation, in relation with the participants. Initially my plan was to use a stationary video camera, and simultaneously be concentrated attentively with all senses on what was going on in the situation¹⁰⁴. However, during the first occasion of video-recording I discovered that a stationary camera meant that no one of the participants was recorded a great deal of the time, since the camera could not cover the whole space of activity. Instead, a hand camera was used, and this implies that I moved with the camera, and the participants noticed that they were being recorded and could signal with words or body if they were comfortable with this.

After each encounter with a class, I wrote complementary notes about my thoughts and experiences from this particular encounter. All notes and documentation during observations were transcribed afterwards.

4.2.2 Interviews

One research focus in present study is on participation pupils' articulations of learning in drama. Articulations can be described as doings and sayings that co-create what a phenomenon can be about (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988; Haraway,

¹⁰⁴ This can be described as multisensory experience and perception (Pink, 2009).

2004; Lykke, 2009/2010). An original meaning of the term *articulate* is to form a connection. Haraway (2004, p. 106) points out that “discourse is just one process of articulation [...] To articulate is to signify. It is to put things together [...]”. The term *articulation* emphasizes that meaning is created as an ongoing process, and it differs from *representation* that can be understood as about something pre-given or existing beyond. As a space for the construction of data about the youths’ articulations, interviews were offered, both individual and group interviews.

It might be seen as a contradiction to use interviews as a method in relation to a nomadic approach. The formulation of questions is based on what is already known, and might therefore not lead to new knowledge (Deleuze, 1977/2002). However, in the present study interviews are considered as a method to provide possibilities for participating youths to express their perceptions, and to explore what drama and learning can be about. (See for example Gunnarsson; 2015; Johansson, 2016)

In the following, I describe how qualitative interviews as a method are interrelated with a nomadic approach, and how it is applied in this study. A point of departure is taken in the view that communication acts are both verbal and corporeal doings, and in the nomad philosophical thought that meaning is created in the encounter between concept and practice (in this case, the practice is the interview occasion).

A qualitative interview is not merely an exchange of asking questions and getting answers (Fontana & Frey, 2008), and knowledge sought is not seen as something available and waiting to be discovered. Instead, an interview can be seen as a meeting that can lead to new knowledge, and simultaneously, the meetings give both the informants and the researcher an opportunity to reflect upon their own perceptions. Since intra-action between participants affects all involved, an interview affects both informants and researcher, and an understanding of what is investigated may also change. (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). This implies a view that knowledge is created in the intra-action between the participants.

However, in this focus on individuals and intra-action are not included embodied intra-actions and intra-actions with the physical space, physical objects, etc. An interview situation is seen in present thesis as “[...] a process where interviewer and the interviewees produce knowledge through the relations that are formed”

(Gunnarsson, 2015, p. 85)¹⁰⁵. These relations include interviewer, interviewees, and material-discursive agents, such as for example “bodies, room and recording equipment” (ibid., p. 86). In this thesis, an interview is seen as an active process in which knowledge is produced (Fontana & Frey, 2008).

Enunciations involve both what is said and how it is said, as silence, facial expressions, gestures, physical position, etc. It also involves what is not being said. Information can be excluded consciously, for various reasons. Sounds, such as for example laughter, yawn or sigh, are communicative modes. Thus, physical movements, sounds and verbal utterances are used in communication (MacLure, 2011, 2013b). Not everything can be communicated over different contexts and modalities (Kress, 2010; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). This implies that everything cannot be directly transferred from one mode to another (Kress, 2010). As has been mentioned in section 3.1.1, in an act of communication, different modes are intra-acting.

This approach to interviews is applicable for both individual interviews and group interviews, although these may imply that other knowledge is produced than in individual interviews (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Meaning is created as an ongoing, collaborative process where different viewpoints can be tried, discussed and challenged. Different participant’s different ways to understand a phenomenon or an experience meet and contribute to new articulations.

In this study, two interviews were realized with the pupils in each class, one verbal interview at the beginning of the research period, and one group interview at the end of the period. In the latter interview, the pupils were given the possibility to use drama as an integrated part, and a description of this is provided in section 4.2.3.

I constructed an interview guide for the interviews (Appendix 1). The first interview has a focus on drama and learning. One question is to tell about a drama situation that the participant wants to highlight, and why this situation is interesting to highlight. The theme for the second interview is similar, but the questions have a focus on experiences of drama within the actual period of education. For the second interview, a question was prepared about something the class has been working with in drama during the period I was following them. This implies that one question

¹⁰⁵ [...] en process där intervjuare och intervjupersoner producerar kunskap genom de relationer som formas (Gunnarsson, 2015, p. 85).]

differs between the classes. The question to tell about a drama situation is also included there, and I offer the possibility to use drama for this. The interview questions are semi-structured, which means that the focus lies on a certain theme, but where informants have possibilities to answer in different ways (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). In the group interview, I did not suggest specific drama conventions, instead I offered the participants to choose a method that they were familiar with and found appropriate.

Interview one was audio-recorded. The pupils could choose if they wanted to participate alone, or together two or three peers. Interview number two was realized in groups with varied number of participants (from three to six). Each interview began with a reminder about research ethics (confidentiality, possibility to withdraw consent for participation any time). The group interviews were video-recorded, provided that all participants gave verbal consent for the actual situation¹⁰⁶. A stationary camera was used since I wanted to focus on being an interviewer and to engage visually, aurally, and kinaesthetically, which might be difficult behind a camera.

The preconditions concerning the time to conduct interviews varied between the schools, regarding both when and for how long. In Aspskolan, the teacher in the subject of Swedish argued that participation in an interview has connections with the goals for Swedish, and since the class had Swedish scheduled right after the drama lesson, it became possible to do the interviews during Swedish lessons. No time was used from drama lessons: all interviews were carried out during the breaks after drama and during Swedish lessons. The drama room was not occupied during this hour of time, so we could stay there. In Tallenskolan, the class had other lessons before and after drama, with a short break in between, and therefore parts of some of the drama lessons and the breaks were used for interviews. Also in Cypresskolan, drama lessons and breaks were used for the interviews, but since the drama education last for a longer time, it was possible to use a short part of the drama lessons for interviews. In both Tallenskolan and Cypresskolan, a group room or temporary empty classroom was used where the interviews could be conducted undisturbed. In all schools, it was necessary to plan in advance which lessons to conduct interviews

¹⁰⁶ If consent for video-recording was not given from someone, the interview was documented with an audio-recording or notes with pen and paper.

in, so that this could be combined with the teachers' plans for lessons in Drama, and where applicable, in Swedish.

The drama teachers were also interviewed. These interviews aimed to provide background information, and were designed as conventional qualitative interviews. A guide was formulated, which included purposes and conditions for drama education, including the teachers' perceptions concerning drama and learning (Appendix 2). These interviews were undertaken at times chosen by the drama teachers, depending in their work situation, and were audio-recorded.

After each interview with a class, I wrote complementary notes about my thoughts and experiences from this particular encounter. Afterwards, I transcribed all notes, and they were used as a tool during the analysis process.

Early in the research process, the idea was born to use drama as a method to produce data about drama and learning. This was based on the thought that this might contribute for exploration of the topic during group interviews. In the following section, I provide a background about drama as an integrated research method in group interviews. The reason to discuss this in a specific section is that there is still not a great deal written about drama as a method to construct data in connection to conventional research methods.

4.2.3 Drama as method to construct data

The above described approach to qualitative interviews has similarities to drama, since the focus is on intra-actions and explorative processes. In this section, the possibilities to use drama as a method in a qualitative research process is discussed. Several drama researchers have highlighted similarities between drama and qualitative research (see for example Gallagher 2008, 2011; Henry 2000; Somers 2002). It can be about an inquiry together. A particular topic (question, theme) is explored. Inquiry is realized as action, and is thus an activity including sensory experiencing, affects and reflection. Because different modes are used simultaneously, the process is multimodal. This can be related to what is mentioned above concerning qualitative interviews. In the translation of content and expression to other modes, there is a change of meaning that may enable a changed

understanding. The use of symbols, multimodal communication and translation between different forms of expression may imply that the use of drama can provide possibilities for informants in a research interview to explore a research issue both verbally and through the corporeal.

Drama-based research (DBR) falls within the umbrella concept of *art-based research*¹⁰⁷. DBR can be defined as "a way of knowing, with a focus on embodied inquiry and communication" (Bresler 2011, s. 322). Bresler highlights some characteristics for drama-based research, such as for example that senses form and inform data production and analysis, and that understanding can be created in an aesthetic, cognitive and emotional space. DBR has been used by other researchers, but then in the form of action research, and as a way to present research results (Bresler, 2011; Leavy, 2015; Rasmussen, 2013a). This implies that drama has been used both as methodological approach and as a method in research. However, according to what I have found drama has seldom been used as a method to construct data within mainstream educational research, connected with other conventional methods.¹⁰⁸ An inspiration to use drama as a method to construct data in the present study is the drama researcher Kathleen Gallagher (2000, 2008, 2011). She describes a research project where researchers and youths participated in an improvised drama in order to take a meta-perspective on a theme (Gallagher, 2008). There were transcripts of interviews reframed, in that participating youths explored through improvised drama what might be found in the material. Both researchers and youths took part in improvised drama that led to shared experiences and shared vocabulary. The common reference point led to a shift in power relations. The subsequent interview could refer to the shared experience in drama, which led to a conversation together more than an interviewer-informant situation. Gallagher concludes that the creation of a context together with participants opens up new possibilities of understanding and interpretation of the issues in focus. Her description gave support

¹⁰⁷ Art-based research is a methodological research field that has expanded in the last decades. It is an umbrella concept for methodological tools (Leavy, 2015), and includes approaches to explore practices (for example, such as action research), data-collecting methods, methods for analysis of data and presentation of results. Such methodologies and methods are used both in the artistic field and beyond.

¹⁰⁸ By DBR I refer here to a conscious use of drama conventions, integrated in a research process. Role-play has also been used as method within other research fields and for various purposes (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

for my construction of the design of group interviews, since it indicated that drama as a method might contribute to that informants are given possibility for articulations with words and actions, about different research issues.

What has been highlighted concerning interviews and drama, in this and in earlier sections, indicates that the use of drama in a group interview may contribute to different kinds of reflection for both participants and researchers, and that collaboration in actions and words may open up for new articulations. In the present empirical study, drama was used as a method to explore issues concerning drama education that take place in other occasions than during the interview, and thereby drama was used as a tool for reflection together. Drama was used as an integral part in the group interviews, and this implies that not only drama was used. The reason was that I considered it important to give possibility for participant to choose if they wanted to communicate orally and/or with physical expressions. They may have brought different kinds of experiences of drama. A fundamental ethical aspect is that participants should feel comfortable in the interview situation, and a contributing factor might be that they had the possibility to choose forms for staging of enunciations. There is in all research interviews a power imbalance and in interviews with children and young people, this is particularly obvious (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). That I as researcher in addition to this was the only one with experiences of the used drama conventions might result in this imbalance of power being enhanced. To avoid this, I considered it important that participants already had personal experiences of drama and that they were familiar with the chosen drama methods.

Provided that these conditions are met, I agree with Gallagher (2011) that the creation of a fictional world together with youths can imply a possibility for knowledge production.

In order to investigate how a drama-based research method could be used as an integrated part of group interviews to construct data, a pilot study was conducted in autumn 2012. This pilot study was undertaken with a group of youths aged 16-19 years, and who participated in a project aimed to increase the awareness about possibilities for young people to participate in societal issues, and about the content of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). Seven youths gave their

consent for participation in a group interview, and participated in this. The interview topic has a focus both on form (drama) and on content (CRC) in relation to learning in drama. The pilot study indicates that the use of drama as an integrated part in a group interview can contribute to a multifaceted data production for analysis. Based on the experiences in the pilot study, the design of group interviews in the empirical study was formed, which has been described in the previous section. Drama was integrated in a similar way as in the pilot study. The interview guide I used in the pilot study was adjusted in order to make possible the construction of data about different aspects about drama and learning, and the revised version is used in the empirical study. The experiences and conclusions concerning documentation led to the choice to use video-recording as documentation method of group interviews. In the pilot study, video-recording was not used at all, and this restricted the possibilities for analysis.

In the pilot study, a thematic, interpretative analysis was used, and this was on reflection insufficient as an analysis strategy to map interconnections of diverse components. Therefore, in the empirical study, I instead used cartography combined with a multimodal analysis. These are described in the following sections.

4.2.4 Cartography

In this study, a focus lies on mapping multiple interconnections of different components and what they do in concrete events. A purpose is “to account for processes, not fixed points” (Braidotti, 2002, p. 173). Cartography is used as an analytical strategy to map intra-acting components in processes of learning in drama, and the rhizomatic movements that are produced (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980/1988). It is a method to analyze connections of the things brought into play, and to make a map of a rhizome. It is not a map that represents fixed spaces or structures, but about temporary connectivity. A map in this sense is a composition of connections between different components, and not an ordinary map. The analysis implies doing several maps of a connection, and looking for doings (Ringrose & Coleman, 2013), in order to disentangle and explore how components contribute to the production of drama in school.

In the analysis process, I go back to the data (video-recordings, audio-recordings, photos, my written notes, and locally formulated documents about drama education) several times and do various maps. I not only do one transcription as *the* representation of data. Each time I go back to the data implies a new encounter in that new things appear or are in focus. Data material, theory and my memories of experiences in the empirical study are co-constructive agents in the mapping.

In the mapping, I look for components that stand out from the data as significant for how learning is done in drama, and the components that are identified during the analysis are: organizational and physical space for drama education, dramatic acting in role and improvisation, and collective processes of learning and becoming. As a next step in the analysis, I focused on how different components are interconnected in the doings.

This focus on active components and how they are interconnected in different events implies that I go between data from the different drama educational practices, in order to map how the components are brought into relation in different sites. I also go between data from the local practices and policy documents on a national level. Thus, the analysis of an event leads to relations to other practices (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988), see also the introduction to chapter 4).

As Braidotti (2006) points out, cartography can be used to study and follow ongoing transformations. Changes and transformations do not take place in a linear way, and cartography can “[...] account for the paradoxes and contradictions” (Braidotti, 2006, p. 31). Moreover, mapping is “not only a task of investigation what there is, but is also concerned with unpacking what might be” (Ringrose & Coleman, 2013, p. 125). It is about doing different readings of doings, in order to explore what it can be – also. Therefore, reflexivity and multisensory engagement were used as tools in the analysis process. These tools are described in the following.

Reflexivity is defined as an “immediate and dynamic process which involves continuing *self*-awareness (Finlay, 2008, p. 6, *Italics in the original text*). It is connected with critical reflection. In this study, reflexivity contributes to a continuous and conscious examination of experiences and perspectives, and to a critical awareness of my own influence on others and on what takes place in the relation. In the analysis process, it can for example be that something calls for attention in the analysis of one activity, and I explore how this can be seen from

different perspectives, and I also go back to data from other events to analyze if the similar takes place there.

However, as Finlay (2008) points out, the concepts of reflection, critical reflection, and reflexivity often tend to be used as interchangeable. Reflection can be understood as a turning back to oneself, about self-reflection, and this might imply introspection “as an end in itself” (Finlay, 2002, p. 215). Critical reflection is about a critical stance concerning one’s own position as a researcher, empirical data and its contextual conditions (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009; Finlay, 2002).

Within the post-humanist field, there is a critique of using reflection as a research method (Barad, 2007; Lykke, 2009/2010). This because the mirrored are considered as fixed entities and new patterns do not appear. The critique includes critical reflection. This is based on the thought that in order to take a critical viewpoint one has to step away from what is going on, and look at it from beside (Deleuze & Guattari, 1991/1994) which can be understood as an oppositional position. It is important for me as researcher continuously being aware of the risk of being trapped in such a use of reflection.

However, when reflecting on something, I always do it from a changed position. It involves being open for alternative ways of seeing and for the new things that might appear. Based on this, I argue that reflexivity can be useful thinking tool in connection with cartographic mapping. In order to being open for things that appear in my encounters with data, reflexivity is combined with multisensory engagement as an analytical tool.

In the previous section 4.2.1, I argued that a multisensory engagement is a part of the intra-action between the participants and me as researcher. Also, in the analysis, senses are taken into consideration (Renold & Mellor, 2013). Data is seen as a co-constructive agent that affects the researcher, simultaneously as the researcher is working with the data. This implies that data are not seen as representations of the “truth” of what took place in the documented situations. Data can evoke memories from a situation, but memory is partial and changing (Braidotti, 2006, Pink, 2009). Each encounter with data can involve a difference of thoughts and affects (Pink, 2011).

As researcher, I engage with data affectively, sensuously, and cognitively. In line with Braidotti (2006, 2010) and MacLure (2013a, 2013b), the affective component is

used in analysis to be more attuned to details in the data that disturb, glows and do not fit in any category or theme. I also go back to data several times and do different “readings”. I listen to sounds and voices of video-recordings without looking at the visual, and look at the visual without sound. I transcribe what I see and hear. I also use my memories and notes with reflections from the situation in order to engage with data in different ways.

A multisensory engagement can both be about a drama strategy and a strategy for analysis in research. In this, my experiences as drama teacher are seen as interconnected with the role as a researcher. I use experiences from drama as a tool in the analysis process, and as a researcher, I continuously and systematically write down what I do and how I do this.

In the drama practices, physical movement, vision and sound interrelate in the communicative acts. In order to catch sight of which communicative modes the participants use, a multimodal analysis is used in combination with the cartography.

4.2.5 Multimodal analysis

A basis for the decision to use multimodal analysis are the thoughts about communication described in section 3.1.1, and the reasoning about interviews in section 4.2.2. In social interplay, various modes are used as semiotic resources to create meaning: all communication is multimodal (Jewitt, 2014). Participants can communicate with actions, words, objects and spatiality (the spatial extent of gestures or movements in the room). In the analysis, different modes of communication come in to focus, how they are used and what they do in the actual situation.

A multimodal analysis might catch some of the complexity of intra-action in drama as an educational process. In the present study, I analyze how different modes are used by participants, in educational situations in drama and in group interviews where drama is used as an integrated part together with verbal communication. The multimodal analysis is used for the video-recorded data from observed situation and group interviews. The focus lies on speech, gazes, facial expressions, voice, gestures,

physical positions and movements in space and intra-action with objects. In the transcriptions are included material and what this does in the activity. I go back to the video-recordings several times, each time with a specific communicative resource in focus for transcription. The multimodal analysis of video-recorded data is followed by a second analysis step where what different components do, and how they are interconnected is focused on.

There might be some limitations of using only multimodal analysis as a strategy. As Pink (2011) points out, multimodal analysis is about looking at data, and describes what can be seen and heard, as separate categories. Even if different modes are seen as interconnected with each other, this might imply that processes including different, interconnected senses, are not caught. Pink argues that senses cannot be understood as “simply interconnected, but as part of a system in which they are not so easily distinguishable” (Pink, 2011, p. 268). There is also a risk that data are forced into the categories of “the five-sense” model” (ibid., p. 265), but that this model is a modern western construct. Similar critique concerning categorization as an analysis method is formulated by MacLure (2013a), but she includes qualitative research in general. Construction of categories is based on what is already known and enclose things into these categories. Thereby, “movement, difference, singularity, emergence, and the entanglement of matter and language” (MacLure, 2013b, p. 169) are missed. On the other hand, coding might imply engagement with data as a slow process that can involve an experimentation of different ways to form categories. According to MacLure coding can be useful if it is combined with openness to things that not fit in, stands out or “glow” (ibid., p. 175).

These possible limitations in connection with an interpersonal focus implies that the multimodal analysis is considered as a complement to the cartography in the present study.

The process of construction and analysis of data is connected with continuously ongoing ethical reflections and considerations. In the following, I highlight research ethical aspects that are central in the present study, in addition to those already mentioned in this chapter.

4.3 Research ethics

The research project is a process of knowledge production, where some things are considered as important, interesting or possible, while others are excluded. The empirical study implies that I, as researcher, am interfering in existing drama educational practices. Choices and interventions are connected with research ethical responsibilities. In the following, ethical considerations are highlighted that are central in the present research project and which not are discussed in connection with the earlier provided description of observations and interviews.

This research project is carried out at a British university, but the empirical study is conducted within a Swedish educational context. This implies that I must follow the ethical guidelines in the two countries. It also makes it necessary to describe in the present report such things as the organization of the Swedish compulsory school system, and to use terms that make sense for readers in both contexts. Potential readers come from both the drama field and the educational field. Thus, ethical considerations not only include all interrelated agents in the research assemblage that has been formed in this study, but also the potential readers of the report. As Bresler (2006, p. 62) points out, the awareness of the readers (or with her choice of term; the audience) is “[...] present at various stages of research, long before the actual rendering of a public report of procedures and results”. This is highlighted here because it includes the potential readers in the ongoing dialogical relation in the whole research process.

The research study is undertaken in accordance with British Educational Research Association's *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research* (2011) and *Data Protection Act* (1998). Vetenskapsrådets (Swedish Research Council's) (2011) guidelines are also followed. These guidelines focus on research ethical matters connected to the questions of what, why, how and for whom, and thereby include the whole research process. In the beginning of the research process, I read these guidelines and local guidelines at the University of Chester. Before the realization of the empirical study, I submitted a research ethics application to the Faculty Research Ethics Committee, the University of Chester, which was approved. I also contacted the Swedish Central Ethical Review Board to find out if an additional ethical vetting is required in Sweden, and was informed that this is not the case.

As I mentioned in section 4.1.1, all participants were given an *Informed consent form* with a request for participation in interviews, and in documentation of drama education in form of video-recording and photography. This is formulated in accordance with British guidelines, and is slightly adapted to the Swedish context.

The participating schools offer drama as regular, scheduled education, and since this is unusual in Sweden, there is a risk for identification. At the same time, all participating pupils and drama teachers are ensured full confidentiality, in accordance with the principles for research ethics. However, some of the participating pupils wanted to appear with names and faces in the research report. The research ethics considerations were communicated by me personally with all involved classes, and then I highlighted the importance of possibilities for full confidentiality, and implications of this. If any of the participants were recognizable, this could imply that many of the classmates also might be. The conversations together with the pupils might give them more understanding about what research ethics imply. No one rejected consent to participate after the conversations.

In the report, no real names are mentioned, neither of participating pupils, teachers, schools nor municipals where the schools are located. Nor is any other information given that might reveal someone's identity. The research study has a focus on examples of what drama education can be about when it is offered as recurring part, and not on particular cases per se. The mapping of components and what they do in different events, implies that the focus for analysis is not about comparing the practices of drama in participating schools. In the presentation of the analysis in this thesis, the given examples are described in ways that prevent the possibility of recognizing the particular school.

Research issues are about participating pupils' articulations of drama and learning. An experience from the previously conducted pilot study was that video-recording might contribute to the documentation of multiple communicative modes. Therefore, I used video-recording as one of the ways for the documentation of data. But the use of equipment for documentation also affects the encounter, and is co-structor of what takes place, and here some ethical aspects connected to this are highlighted.

That video-recording can be used to document multiple modes of communication and different communicative activities in one situation does not imply that video-recorded data are more truthful than other forms of documentation. Different forms

produce different data (Gallagher & Kim, 2008), depending on how it affects participants in the study, and how it is used by and affect the researcher during the encounter and in the analysis. Recordings might catch doings that are not intended to be documented, which might imply the possibility for analysis of various aspects. Here, it is important to delimit the analysis to issues set out in information to participants (HSFR, 1996). On the other hand, the writing of notes can include information that cannot be captured by visual or auditory documentation, such as for example a kinaesthetic sensation (Pink, 2009). In addition to practical reasons mentioned earlier in this chapter, these factors are crucial for the choice to use different forms of documentation (written notes, audio-recording, video-recording and photography). Initially, I informed if I was going to write notes or at the beginning of an encounter tell that I would like to use a digital form of documentation. Consent for this particular occasion was given verbally, in addition to the signed forms.

As mentioned earlier, a hand camera was used during observations. This made it possible to avoid a participant without consent becomes recorded without being singled out in front of the group, since I easily could pause the recording. In the group interviews where drama was offered as a method, a stationary camera was used, since I wanted to interact as interviewer without being behind a camera. All the participants in interviews have written consent to participate both in interviews and recordings, and these were complemented with a verbal consent in the specific situation.

Ethical aspects concerning data handling have been considered. Digital recording not only records, but produces a product (Gallagher & Kim, 2008), and has to be handled in an ethically responsible way both during the construction of data and afterwards. I alone as researcher have access to recordings, photos and notes, and they are used in my analysis work. Quotations may be inserted in the final report, but then in a way which does not make it possible to identify any participant. Names of participants (pupils, teachers and schools) are not kept together with data. From the beginning of the research process, the schools are mentioned in my notes as School A, C and T. In this report, these designations are changed to fictive names, Aspskolan, Cypresskolan and Tallenskolan. The schools are situated in Sweden and therefore names in Swedish are used. Participating pupils have fictive names in the report. Since present

study does not have a focus on issues concerning gender, names do not show if I refer to a boy or a girl in the data material.

Participating pupils in this study are between 11 and 14 years old, which is why informed consent is required from both a legal guardian and the child¹⁰⁹.

4.3.1 Research with children

BERA's (2011) guidelines refer to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which says: "In all actions concerning children [...] the best interest of the child shall be a primary consideration [and] to ensure the child such protection and care as is necessary for his or her well-being (article 3). In the article 12, the child's right to express his or her own view freely in all matters affecting her or him is stressed. These articles highlight the importance of a "child perspective" and the "child's perspective". "Child perspective" is about what is defined as the child's needs, by someone other than the child in question (for example a teacher). "Children's perspective" is about the child's right to be heard (Aronsson, 2012, Qvarsell, 2003). The first article gives rise to questions about views of children; who is it possible to be as an underage citizen, and who has the power to decide about this? The other article leads to questions about conditions required which allow children to express their views. I will mention something about the first issue, and then discuss the second in connection to research where children are informants.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child talks about the rights of each individual child. The child is a person in her or his own right. This implies that it is not about children as a general category. At the same time, the convention does talk about a global, general child where variations and contextual factors are not included (Greene & Hill, 2005, Qvarsell, 2003). Such factors have impact on how a child is positioned/ can position herself.

¹⁰⁹ In BERA's (2011) guidelines, it is stressed that both children and legal guardians should give consent, and here no specific age of children is mentioned but references to United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child indicate that children are all people younger than 18 years. The Swedish Act on Ethical vetting of Research Involving Humans (2003:460) (in Swedish: *Etikprövningslagen*) says that children younger than 15 years always must have consent from a legal guardian, but if children are between 15 and 18 years are given specific directions.

This also concerns research (Aronsson, 2012, Greene & Hill, 2005, Qvarsell, 2003). The researcher's views about children affect in which ways they are given possibilities to intra-act as participants in a research study. In the present study, participating children are considered as co-constructing agents, together with other agents. At the same time, I as researcher am interfering with research methods which open up for certain ways of participation and processes, but not others. As adult and researcher, I have knowledge about methods, and the empirical study is "adult-designed" (Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008, p. 502). But as Gallacher and Gallagher point out, it depends on how the methods are used, "the methodological *attitude* taken" (ibid., p. 513), which for example can be about to use open-ended questions that promote conversation together, and to provide possibilities for the children to engage with other agents in experimentation together.

The possibilities to express oneself in multiple modes affects whether children are heard. One of the main differences between children and adults is verbal competence (Aronsson, 2012, Greene & Hill, 2005). Not only verbal utterances, but also for example "[...] gestures, prosody, facial expressions, physical actions and utilization of the room" (Aronsson, 2012, p. 114)¹¹⁰, are communicative resources. *How* and *whether* children's voices are heard depends on in what ways they are listened to. In the present study, this assumption is a point of departure for choice of data construction method and analysis of data. As mentioned earlier in the present chapter, the participants are given the possibility to use drama in the second interview, which is a group interview. This reasoning might seem to contradict that one criterion for choice of participants is about verbal capacity. However, the point here is that perceptions about drama and learning can be communicated with different modes, both verbal and corporeal.

Relational aspects in communication with children have to be considered. Aronsson (2012), Aronsson and Hundeide (2002), and Greene and Hill (2005) highlight ways in which children sometimes answer questions. Responses might reflect a wish "to please the adult and to maintain friendly relations" (Aronsson & Hundeide, 2002, p. 181). The relation here-and-now lies in focus, not the facts alone. This is termed "relational rationality".

¹¹⁰ ["[...] gester, prosodi, mimik, fysiskt handlande och utnyttjande av rummet" (Aronsson, 2012, p. 114)]

The possibilities for children to have their voices heard are also connected to how their utterances are reported (Halldén, 2003). In all research the researcher's ways to transcribe, analyze and present data include interpretations about what to include and how to include it (Fangen, 2004/2005; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). To transcribe data to a written text implies that utterances are translated to another mode. These changes depend on how I as researcher do these transcriptions. To include that an informant use special expressions, struggle with how to pronounce a word etc., can imply that attention is taken from the content, and in addition that an informant might be possible to identify. An additional complication enters when transcriptions are translated to another language (Halldén, 2003). In this study, the empirical study is realized in Sweden and data are constructed in Swedish, while the research report is written in English. In order to make it possible for participating children to be heard, I give the original Swedish transcription together with my English translation. The translation in English is written in italics right after the quotation in Swedish.

In conclusion, there are some ethical aspects to consider in research where children are informants. It is important to not take distinctions between children and adults for granted, but to be open to what takes place in the relation.

4.4 Reflections about method

As has been mentioned at the beginning of the present chapter, within post-constructionism, there is not one given method to use and how to apply this. That the choice of methods is done in the actual research study is connected with possibilities in that it opens up for sensitivity for the most appropriate ones (Lykke, 2009/2010, Olsson, 2008), and for what Lykke (2009/2010, p. 164) formulates as “a reflexive experimental stance”. At the same time, this is connected with a risk because the same methods might not have been combined and tried out previously (Greene, 2013). Therefore, the researcher must account as carefully as possible for use of methods and the ethical implications related to these. This is of course necessary in all research studies, but when methods are applied in a new way, the account for these must be even more cautious.

So why not use an established methodology? In the present research study, this might for example have implied to remain with the social constructionist approach that now is an included part, and related to this, use a multimodal analysis. This maybe could have been combined with the interpretative analysis used in the pilot study. At an earlier stage of the research process, this alternative was considered. However, I was missing the physical body in interaction with physical spaces and objects. I was also missing a tool to catch sight of and further analyze processes.

The limitations of post-constructionism as methodological approach and the methods used to construct and analyze data will be further discussed in section 8.4.

The nomadic approach has been criticized as being complicated. However, as Olsson (2008, p. 39) points out, “it is precisely because it creates its conditions for thinking as it proceeds that it is no longer forced to rely on the codes and habits of every day life”. For me as a practitioner drama teacher and drama researcher, this implies a possibility to understand the practice in a new way.

Part III

Analysis of Data Produced in the Empirical Study

In this part, I enquire what drama can be when offered as a scheduled subject within compulsory schooling in Sweden, and which learning processes are then made possible. In chapter 5, the focus lies on the local organization of drama education and on the pupils' expressed perceptions about drama. In chapters 6 and 7, I emphasize what characterizes drama education and learning in and through drama. In chapter 6, I focus on dramatic acting in role, and in chapter 7, emphasis is on improvisation. Dramatic acting in role and improvisation are interconnected with each other, but in this part they are foregrounded separately in order to enquire how each of them contribute to how learning takes place in drama education. In the last chapter, I provide a summarized discussion of the research issues, and which conclusions are drawn from this study.

In the mapping, earlier presented theories and concepts are put in movement together with the empirical data. I go between all documented data from the participating local practices of drama education. Connections are also drawn to practices on a macro-level (national school policy documents, dominating approaches to drama etc.) that have been traced in the genealogical analysis of drama in the compulsory school system in Sweden (see chapter 2).

5. Space-time for drama

In participating schools within the present study, drama is given organizational space-time and physical space as a formally scheduled subject. In this chapter, I enquire how the local organization of drama education, with designated physical space, contributes to what drama can be. Taking a post-constructionist approach, these factors are considered as practices that actively intervene and co-produce educational practices (Ball, Maguire & Braun, 2012; Gunnarsson, 2015). In this context, the concept of *space* refers both to the school's organizational framework and to the physical place for educational settings. Physical and social spaces are interconnected, in that physical spaces are shaped by humans and simultaneously serve to govern what it is possible to do and hence open up for certain activities (Foucault, 1975/1991; Franks, 2015a; Kirkeby, 2006). *Time* refers to regulation in schedules and priorities of activities. Space and time are interlinked in that schedules regulate where and when lessons, breaks, and so forth, take place (Foucault, 1975/1991; Gordon, Holland & Lahelma, 2000). In order to visualize this connection between space and time, I combine them with a hyphen.

5.1 Drama in the schedule – possibilities and tensions

In this section, the focus lies on how drama as a scheduled subject is constructed through locally formulated purposes of drama, and on the organization and structure of drama education. A related focus lies also upon pupils' expressed perceptions of drama.

5.1.1 Locally formulated purposes with drama education

All three participating schools are situated in bigger municipalities where there are several schools. As I mentioned in section 2.2.7, the free choice of school implies that pupils and parents can choose which school to attend. Thus, pupils and their parents become customers that schools need to attract. The school website is a space for marketing the school.

All schools, through their websites, highlight that drama education is offered. There are arguments for having drama, for example that “drama strengthens pupils,

and is a tool for all pupils to feel safe and have a good knowledge development”¹¹¹. In the presentations, it is emphasized that drama is a tool for learning in theoretical subjects, especially Swedish and English, and that the practice of drama should collaborate with these subjects. It is for example written in one of the school’s presentations: “the collaboration is focused primarily on Swedish and to some extent on English”. It is also said that it is a tool for development of general competences (particularly communicative and social competences). On Cypresskolan’s and Tallenskolan’s websites it is mentioned that drama education contributes to learning in the art form (for example, to use drama techniques and to create a dramatic play from idea to performance).

One reading of the presentations on websites is that drama is legitimated primarily by the perceived benefits of an individual’s acquisition of academic subject knowledge. In order to attract pupils to the school, the focus in marketing lies on how education can provide the best possibilities to achieve good results in theoretical subjects, and drama is simply regarded as an instrument for this. According to this reading, drama is given an instrumental value since it is seen as useful for knowledge acquisition and results in other subjects (see Fredriksson, 2013).

Another reading of the information about the collaboration with other subjects is that different school subjects can provide different ways of knowing, and that drama is therefore a useful complement. Through a cross-fertilization of different school subjects pupils can experience various ways of knowing. This reading is related to what appear in local documents (the local syllabus in Aspskolan, the formulated plan in Cypresskolan, and the formulated goal and purposes in Tallenskolan), and the three drama teachers’ oral descriptions of the subject of Drama. The individual school’s decision makers and drama teacher have together formulated these documents. For example, it is said in one of Tallenskolan’s local documents that drama contributes to the development of “ability to collaborate, self-awareness and self-confidence”¹¹², and that an interdisciplinary approach implies that drama contributes to learning in different subjects and that “pupils and teachers get a larger

¹¹¹ [”drama stärker eleverna och är ett verktyg för att alla elever ska känna sig trygga och ha en god kunskapsutveckling”]

¹¹² [”samarbetsförmåga, självinsikt och självförtroende”]

holistic view across the subject boundaries”¹¹³. In Aspskolan’s local syllabus, it is argued that drama education aims to “actively use and develop imagination, creativity, spontaneity and empathy”¹¹⁴, and an increased ability “to reflect [...] and to see a phenomenon from different perspectives”¹¹⁵.

From these sources (the local syllabus, and formulated plan and goals), a picture appears of drama as both an art subject that involves learning in drama as art form and learning that promote general competences, and a subject that usefully connects with other school subjects. It can be understood that drama is an art subject with an intrinsic value as well as a resource for learning about other school subjects (instrumental value). This reflects the idea that it is not about either intrinsic or instrumental values, but that these are interconnected and mutually affect each other (see Fleming, 1999).

Thus, in website displays and in local documents, two different discourses about what drama is and can be seem to appear.

5.1.1.1 Motives to choose a school with drama education

The motivation to choose a school with drama on the schedule may impact how drama education is perceived by pupils. If the choice is based on a previously existing interest in drama, this might contribute towards pupil and parent motivation. In Tallenskolan, this is an argument as to why drama class is offered as an option. In Aspskolan and Cypresskolan, drama is a compulsory subject for all pupils during some school years.

According to the views of participating pupils within the present study, a large majority of pupils attending Aspskolan and Cypresskolan appear to have chosen the school because it is located close to home. Only a few pupils claim to have chosen the school primarily because drama education is offered. In Tallenskolan, some pupils said they had chosen the school because it is located close to home and/or that they heard it is a good school. As a next step, they chose to attend drama class, and claim this was mostly due to an interest in drama/theatre, but sometimes because a

¹¹³ [”elever och lärare får en större helhetssyn över ämnesgränserna”]

¹¹⁴ [”aktivt använda och utveckla sin fantasi, kreativitet, spontanitet och inlevelseförmåga”]

¹¹⁵ [”att reflektera [...] och se ett fenomen ur olika perspektiv”]

friend had chosen it. Some of the pupils have chosen the school primarily because drama class is an option.

Thus, it seems that a majority of pupils have not primarily chosen drama education in the process of selecting a school.

5.1.2 Organization and structure of drama as a scheduled subject

All the participating schools offer drama as a scheduled subject at some point in time. The duration of drama lessons varies between the schools depending on how the “school’s own choice” is organized within the guidelines stated by the Education Act (SFS 2010:800). Drama is a so-called “local option” and a plan for this must be approved by the National Agency for Education.

In Tallenskolan, drama classes are offered as an option for grades 7-9, and pupils have the possibility to make a re-selection every year. In Cypresskolan, it is compulsory to attend drama education, which is offered in grades 4-5. In Aspskolan, it is compulsory in grades 3-7, and in grade 8, drama is an option for the pupils’ own choice. As a subject, drama has a fixed position in the schedule in line with other subjects.

As mentioned above, in all the schools there is an expressed intention that drama should collaborate with other school subjects. Examples of collaborations between drama and other school subjects that are mentioned in interviews with the teachers are creations of dramatizations based on themes that the class are working with in civics, history, science or Swedish. Related to work with theatre performances drama can collaborate with crafts and music. In Aspskolan, the collaboration consists of drama teacher supporting teachers in other school subjects to integrate drama as a method in their education. In Cypresskolan and Tallenskolan the collaboration takes place as a process of planning between teachers, where each teacher then designs the educational content of her subject in line with this. This thesis deals mainly with the practice of collaboration between drama and the school subject of Swedish because this occurs most often within the data.

An example in Tallenskolan is the work with detective stories as a literature genre that was planned together by the drama teacher and the Swedish teacher. During lessons in Swedish, pupils were introduced to the genre through reading and writing,

discussing and interpreting texts. Thereafter, in drama lessons pupils created a theatre play, from inception to performance, based on this genre. A point of departure for the planning was taken from the syllabus for the subject of Swedish: it was based on a literature genre. The work in Swedish lessons constituted a basis for assessment with a formal grade. This example can be read in two ways. It might be that due to time constraints teachers decided who should do what and then carried it out individually in their scheduled teaching. Another reading is that the collaboration was based on somewhat unequal conditions insofar as drama education seems to scaffold the education about a literature genre in Swedish. More than collaboration, drama education is adapted to the process of Swedish. This can be understood as a hierarchical division of what counts as high-status knowledge (Foucault, 1975/1991).

In the interviews with drama teachers, it appears that very little time is provided for them and teachers of other subjects to plan together and thus realize the potential to collaborate. They express some frustration that the time they have available for planning is filled with other tasks which are required by school policies and priorities of the school leaders. An example of what teachers mean, in terms of priorities that govern their time, is the Swedish National Agency for Education's large-scale education program *Matematiklyftet*¹¹⁶ (in English approximately: Lifting mathematics) which, during this period, demanded a lot of time from several teachers. Thus, it seems that, even if schools have a purpose to encourage collaboration between drama and other subjects, in practice there is insufficient time for teachers to plan and work collaboratively. In addition, according to what drama teachers expressed during their interviews, the constraint of scheduled subject teaching did not allow for team-teaching across subjects or, indeed, working with a group of pupils this way.

My reading of this is that requirements imposed by decision makers at a national and local level serve to govern the time available for teachers and so further prevent collegial collaboration. In this sense, the lack of time for collaboration, together with a clear separation of different school subjects, produces the effect of a dividing practice (Foucault 1975/1991).

¹¹⁶ *Matematiklyftet* was an extensive, state-funded education program aimed at teachers throughout Sweden with the aim of increasing pupils' goal fulfillment in mathematics.

5.1.2.1 Content and structure of the drama lessons

As mentioned, the overall purpose for drama education in participating schools concerns different learning: learning in drama as an art form, and learning different subject matters and communication, social interplay etc. through drama. Beyond these formulated purposes and the national curriculum, there are no regulations for how to structure drama education since there is no national syllabus for drama.

Locally formulated information about drama and its purposes also constitutes the descriptions of the content for the subject drama. The term *content* refers here to the knowledge content for a school subject. Content can also refer to formulated knowledge content for a thematic work or an educational occasion, and in this thesis is termed as “object of learning”. It is the intentional object for learning formulated by the drama teacher, and which captures different forms of knowing.¹¹⁷ The summary below of a plan written by the drama teacher in Cypresskolan provides an example of what it can become. During a period of some weeks, the pupils worked with the fairy tale *Red riding hood and the wolf*. The pupils adapted the fairy tale in small groups to a given literature genre and then created a linked dramatization.

In the plan, connections were made to the curriculum and knowledge content for the subject of Swedish. It included, among other things, an exploration of how the story might be interpreted, knowing about a literature genre, social skills concerning collaboration and communication, art form-related knowing about how to present and express a role character, and how to adapt the performance depending on who are supposed to be the audience. (Summarized from the formulated plan, Cypresskolan, autumn 2014.)

According to my reading, the purposes of this plan appear related to values and general competences (collaboration and communication), to knowing about a subject matter (literature genre and text interpretation), and to form-related knowing (to adapt the interpretation to dramatic form, to express a role character, and to adapt the performance to a specific audience). The adaptation to an audience depended on whether the group would like to make a performance for their classmates or in

¹¹⁷ Therefore, maybe it should be more accurate to use the term “learning area”, suggested by Bolton (1992, p. 116), but in order to not insert too many new terms in the thesis I keep the term “object for learning”.

addition to them for another class as well (a preschool class or class 1). This can be understood providing the opportunity to participate in decision-making as part of a group. Taken together, the plan contains different kinds of knowing that are non-hierarchically interconnected.

Only the drama teacher in Cypresskolan formulated written plans for learning objects, but in the interviews with all drama teachers a similar view emerges concerning what objects of learning in drama can be.

The three drama teachers use a similar design of their drama lessons, according to the documented data. The lessons are designed as sequences of activities that follow each other as a process with three phases: an introduction phase, acting phase, and reflection phase¹¹⁸ (Sternudd, 2000). In Aspskolan and Cypresskolan, the introduction phase consists of an exercise or game with a focus on teamwork and/or theatre techniques. This is followed by the acting phase: improvisation together in the whole group, or, most frequently, working in small groups to create a dramatized situation, which is then presented to classmates. During a specified period or separate lesson, the main focus might be concerned with a specific drama genre (for example forum play), working form (for example, improvisation) or work with a specific subject-related matter (for example, work with a literature genre in Swedish). After an exercise or at the end of the lesson, the teacher rallies the group for a collective reflection about that lesson's drama work, even though such a reflection phase did not take place during every lesson.

In Tallenskolan, this structure appears over a longer period of time but not in each separate lesson. There, the drama work can be seen as a progression from teamwork and exercises aimed to introduce drama-specific working forms and techniques, to work with the creation of a theatre performance.

It can be seen as a general structure for these schools, which is applied differently by the drama teachers depending on the length of lessons, for example if the class has a period of rehearsal for theatre performance or otherwise in circumstances that affect the education.

This structure employing phases is often used across different drama practices and not only in school education (Sternudd, 2000), even though there are different

¹¹⁸ In Swedish, the phases are termed *inledningsfas*, *ageringsfas* and *bearbetningsfas* (Sternudd, 2000).

possible ways to structure a drama process, for example as process drama. However, within drama practices in Sweden, this structure is frequently used, and is described, for example, in the drama handbook *Undervisa i pedagogiskt drama*, by Rasmusson and Erberth (2016).

In both Tallenskolan and Cypresskolan, progression over time within drama education goes from focusing on group dynamic exercises and the introduction of drama-specific working forms and techniques, to common work on the creation of a theatre play. A similar idea appears in Aspskolan in that compulsory drama education focuses on the former, while drama as an option for pupils' own choice in grade 8 has an emphasis on theatre performance.

This approach to structure and progress can be seen as linear in that it follows certain phases in a given, predetermined order (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988). It can be related to developmental psychology in that in the beginning of a drama process, participants need to explore their own resources and to interact through less advanced exercises, progressing to more advanced improvisations and dramatizations, and then on to the creation of theatre plays. Influences can be traced to Ward's idea that *Creative dramatics* can be a preparation and complement to working with theatre plays (Rasmussen, 1990), and to Way's (1967) ideas about development in drama. (See also section 2.2.2 in the present thesis).

In the data, no clear formulated plan for progression of drama skills can be identified. Different genres and techniques are introduced in education, and the youths successively take more and more responsibility in work with theatre performances. Through practice, they can become more skilled in using the tools to which they have been introduced. It might lead to more knowledge of certain components, but not necessarily deeper and more complex knowledge concerning how to apply them in new ways. This can also be seen as a linear process.

5.1.2 Pupils' voices about drama

This section focuses pupils' expressed perceptions and experiences of drama and learning in drama. In the interviews, drama is described as fun and as different from other subjects. The adjectives "fun" and "different" are frequently used. Two

significations of the term “different” can be identified in that it is used as an amplification of drama as fun, and as a difference which gives rise to particular tensions. In the following part, the first signification applies, and in the subsequent part the latter.

The excerpts provided are chosen because they are representative of what is expressed during pupil interviews from all participating classes.

5.1.2.1 Fun and different

Drama is described as fun and different because it provides possibilities for learning through acting in role in interaction with others.

Jag tycker drama är väldigt kul. Det är lite annorlunda och det är väldigt, väldigt roligt att göra. Det är något som du lär dig väldigt mycket av. Det är inte bara att du sitter till exempel på en stol och gör ett mattetal, utan du gör saker med hela din kropp och tillsammans med andra. Så du pratar väldigt mycket med andra. Och så ska man också försöka vara någon annan person väldigt mycket... Och man ska tänka lite annorlunda när man gör, man ska inte tänka som man alltid gör. Man ska tänka hur det skulle bli om man gör nåt sånt istället för det. Och sen kanske du kan ta med dig det i livet så du kanske ser hur du skulle kunna göra på olika sätt.

I think drama is very fun. It is a bit different and very, very fun to do. It is something from which you learn very much. You are for example not only sitting on a chair and working with a maths problem, but you do things with the entire body and together with others. So you talk very much with others. And you should also try very much to be another person... You should think how it might be if you do something like this instead of like that. And then you might take it with you in the life so that you maybe can see how you can do things in different ways. (Sonny, interview I: 36)

To try to be another person refers to dramatic acting in role. Sonny talks both about the bodily doing and to imagine and think about the role's doing. Together, these enunciations can be understood as acting in role is perceived as a simultaneous exterior expression, and interior experiencing and imagination (see Courtney, 1990, 1995; Fleming, 1999; Gallagher, 2000). Later in the same interview, Sonny tells more about how acting in role can contribute to learning:

Drama är väldigt mycket känslor och inlevelse. Du får föreställa dig att du är en annan person än dig själv. Du får tänka mycket mer och ha jättemycket inlevelse. Det kan man ta med sig till verkligheten, hur man är mot andra.

[...] ¹¹⁹

När man haft drama kan man prata inför en folkmassa, man kan prata väldigt tydligt, och man kan mima saker tydligt. Och man kan leva sig in i någon annan person, hur han/hon har det. Och att inte vara blyg utan vara stolt över dig själv.

Drama is very much emotions and empathy. You can imagine that you are a person other than yourself. You get to think a lot more and have much empathy. This is something you can bring to real life, how you are towards others.

[...]

When you have had drama you can talk in front of a crowd, you can speak very clearly, and mimic things clearly. And you can empathize with someone else, how he or she has it. And not be shy but be proud of yourself.

(Sonny, interview I: 36)

Sonny uses the Swedish expression *leva sig in i*, and, according to how I understand the signification and its correspondence in English, the expression would mean:

“empathize with – identify oneself with”. To simplify, I use the translation “empathize with”.

According to my reading, an understanding of the other’s perspective and perceived situation is taking place through a process of acting in role in communication with others. Thereby, it might promote the ability to empathize with others and to learning about communication. This being the case, acting in role can contribute to experiences of what one can become and so act in various ways, both in role and through social interplay in ordinary life. It might be simultaneously a both-and conjunction because drama can be about a temporal actualization of potential being (Deleuze, 1995/2001). This reading also applies to Andrea’s statement:

¹¹⁹ In quotations, the symbol [] is used to mark changes made by me: [...] marks that part of the text has been omitted in the quotation. [D] or [d] marks change between uppercase and lowercase letters. [Text in between] is added to clarify what is referred to in actual quotation. When ... is used in a quotation, this marks that a person makes a short pause during a verbal utterance. When single words are expressed with emphasis, these are underlined.

I drama har jag lärt mig att fokusera mer. Om man inte fokuserar så lyssnar man inte när den andra pratar. Och jag har lärt mig att spela teater. Men det är ju så mycket mer än att spela teater, jag har lärt mig att jag kan vara många olika roller, att jag inte behöver vara en och samma hela tiden.

In drama I have learned to focus more. If you don't focus, you don't listen when the others talk. And I have learned to play theatre. But it is so much more than playing theatre, I have learned that I can be many different roles, that I don't have to be one and the same all the time. (Andrea, interview I: 28)

In the interviews, dramatic acting in role is emphasized as central to drama. The youths express that the possibility to use the whole body to explore and express the dramatic role is significant for drama being fun and contributing to learning. This includes also improvisation. To create a play may involve both planning and improvisation. Improvisation is considered fun and, because participants can come up with new and unforeseen actions, as a co-actor one must pay attention to what goes on here-and-now (Courtney, 1990). In some interviews, youths express that in addition to being fun, it is difficult because it can be hard to find out what to do and say. However, there does not appear to be any contradiction between fun and difficulty when it concerns improvisation. One reading of this is that things that are perceived as difficult within the drama form can be seen also as fun challenges.

Det är kul när man får improvisera, och bara får komma på saker... Man lär sig att koncentrera sig.

It's fun when you improvise, and just can come up with things... You learn to concentrate. (Elia, interview I: 14)

När man skulle improvisera när andra kollar på, så skulle man komma på saker... Det var rätt så svårt, men det var ändå kul att komma på nåt sätt, och det kändes bra.

When you improvise when others are watching, you come up with things... It was quite difficult, but it was still fun to come up with a way, and it felt good. (Juno, I: 13)

The term “theatre” is used by youths to describe working together to create a dramatization regardless of whether this involves improvised short plays created in small groups during a lesson, or theatre plays prepared over a longer period. In addition to empathizing with others, participants highlighted that dramatizations are apt to express emotions.

I drama får man uttrycka sina känslor i en teater. Man får spela upp nånting på scen.

In drama, you can express your emotions in a theatre. You can play something on stage. (René, interview 1: 18)

Det är som en pjäs. Man gör det tillsammans med andra personer, inte bara själv. Man lever sig in i olika karaktärer, och man lär sig väldigt mycket genom det.

It is like a theatre play. You do it together with other people, not just yourself. You empathize with different characters, and you learn a lot through it. (Alde, interview II: 7)

The descriptions of drama as embodied experiencing and expressing in role, the creation of dramatizations and improvisation points to a view of drama as art form. One reading of the data is that this creates a perception of drama as something different. Simultaneously, it is a group activity, which implies that dramatic action and learning about social interplay takes place as a relational doing. Social interaction thus manifests itself as dramatic acting, in communication through exercises and plays. In addition to contribute to a knowing to empathize with others and to communicate, it contributes to knowing of social interplay. This suggests a view that drama is perceived as an art form that contributes to a variety of knowing.

I drama lär man sig hela tiden om varandra och om sig själv. Och om andra och om hur samspel funkar.

In drama, you learn all the time about each other and about yourself. And about others and how interaction works. (Vanja, interview I: 20)

Kari: - Det roligaste är att man får göra teater och så, tycker jag, och såna här olika övningar.

- *The most fun is that you get to do theatre and so, I think, and such different exercises.*

Elia: - Det roliga är att du inte gör skolämnen. Du sitter inte, du rör på dig.

Och du leker, fast inte som man gör när man är liten (skrattar till) utan typ lek för stora.

- *The fun part is that you do not do school subjects. You are not sitting, you are moving. And you play, but not as you do when you are small (laugh) but like grown-up play.* (Kari and Elia, interview I: 14)

Cay: - I drama tränar man på att våga prata inför andra, visa lite känslor... våga prata med andra i klassen.

- *In drama you practise to dare to talk in front of others, to express some emotions... to dare to talk with others in the class.*

Disa: - Man får göra grupparbeten... med varandra, så man måste samarbeta. Då förstår man att man inte kan göra allting själv, utan man måste samarbeta. Och det tror jag man har med sig sen i framtiden också. Om man ska göra en uppgift så måste man ju samarbeta. Ingen kan ju klara allting själv.

- *You do group work... with each other, so you must collaborate. Then you understand that you cannot do everything yourself, but you have to collaborate. And I think that you bring this with you in the future. If you are to do a task, then you have to collaborate. Nobody can handle everything oneself.* (Cay and Disa, interview I: 5)

Disa's notion that "[i]f you shall do a task then you have to collaborate. Nobody can handle everything oneself" indicates a view at odds with the prevailing individualization in school education. *Individualization* is defined here as the governing technique to produce autonomous individuals who take responsibility for their own welfare, and simultaneously willingly adapt to desired requirements. In school education, this is a form of governance through, for example, the measurement and comparison of pupils (Foucault, 1982; Rose, 1996). Disa's enunciation about collaboration might be understood as a doing where each participant contributes to a common creation through a collective process. The

concept “collective” is used here not as meaning contrary to “individual” but as an intra-action¹²⁰.

At the same time, collaboration is perceived as something difficult. Engagement in a drama activity requires willingness to attend and an acceptance of the common work (Bundy, 2003). It can, for example, mean that participants in a group may not agree and that this can lead to trouble. In practice, this can be both difficult and boring because group members must handle this and also find a solution. To be difficult, in this context refers to being boring.

Det roligaste är när man ska arbeta i [liten] grupp och göra en pjäs [...] Det svåraste är om vi inte kan samarbeta i gruppen. Det är bra att ha delade grupper, men det svåraste är om man inte kommer överens när man ska arbeta i grupp. För då blir det bara bråk. Då måste man försöka reda ut det, och då... till sist blir det ju bättre.

The most fun part is when you are to work in a [small] group and make a play. [...] the hardest thing is if we cannot cooperate in the group. It's good to have divided groups, but the hardest thing is if you do not agree when you are working in a group. Because then there will just be fighting. Then you have to try to solve it, and then ... at last it will be better. (Nour, interview I: 24)

The significance that something is fun for learning to take place, is described by two of the youths, Nenne and Chris:

Nenne: - Det mesta i drama vill jag lära mig. Om jag vill lära mig, har jättestort intresse, då är det inte svårt för mig. Men om jag tycker att det är jättetråkigt, då tar det lite längre tid för då känner jag att jag måste göra det, inte för att jag vill göra det.

- Most things in drama I want to learn. If I want to learn something, have very much interest, then it is not difficult for me. But if I think it is very boring, then it takes a little bit longer because I feel that I have to do it, not because I want to do it.

¹²⁰ This definition of the concept of “collective” differs from that which is frequently used, namely, that the collective is about uniformity (Illeris, 2015, see also section 3.4.1 in this thesis).

(Nenne, interview I:12)

Chris: - Drama är ett bra sätt att lära sig. Man bara fokuserar på sig själv och det man ska göra. Om man bara fokuserar och har kul, då blir man bara bättre och bättre, om man har kul.

- *Drama is a great way to learn. You just focus on yourself and what you are to do. If you just focus and have fun, then you become better and better, if you have fun.* (Chris, interview I: 35)

To focus in this sense can be understood as attentiveness and presence in relation to bodily and social doing, both in actual and fictive contexts. Focusing relates to desire in relation to something, in this case interacting and learning within a drama activity. In line with Deleuze and Guattari's (1972/2004, 1980/1988) reasoning, engagement is created as an encounter of the subject's desire and the object to learn, and where engagement is a prerequisite for learning. The engagement can be described as an interconnected affective, sensory and cognitive process, which might be experienced by the subject as 'fun'. To be experienced as fun, there has also to be a willingness to be a part of the actual context, and in drama, this includes both the social and the fictive context (see Bundy, 2003; Courtney, 1990; Gallagher, 2000).

A prerequisite for engagement in drama is also embodied expression and interaction, which is mentioned earlier in the present section. In the interviews, pupils seldom highlighted boring things in association with drama. When they did so, it was about peers' lack of engagement in group work as mentioned above, and/or about just sitting and talking or writing on a script. The latter is perceived as boring because it does not include bodily action and lasts for a long time.

Det tråkigaste är att man sitter och pratar så mycket. Det tar så lång tid och man måste vänta på att få spela.

The most boring part is that you sit and talk so much. It takes so long time and you have to wait to act. (Joan, interview II: 6)

One reading of this is that, besides not including bodily acting and expressing, this is perceived to be similar to ordinary school education, which leads on to the next section.

5.1.2.2 Differences that give rise to tensions

In the interviews, youths highlight divergences between drama education and the ordinary school education that give rise to tensions. They talked about “ordinary school education” and as “the rest of the school” synonymously.

One key difference is that drama and education in other school subjects offer different ways of knowing. Participating youths expressed the view that they perceived a division of education in theoretical subjects where they often sit and work individually, and drama that involves bodily expressions, dramatic acting, and social interaction. This difference is highlighted by Alex and René when they discuss how they learn new things. In the following excerpt, they refer to ordinary school lessons:

René: -Jag tycker inte att jag lär mig så himla mycket på lektionerna, när man ska sitta och lyssna. Jag vill... göra sakerna... Istället för att bara sitta och läsa så vill jag göra det istället. Man vill göra något, inte teoretiskt men praktiskt.

- I don't think that I learn so much during the lessons, when you sit and listen. I want to... do things... instead of just sitting and listening I want to do things instead. You want to do something, not theoretical but practical.

Alex: -Ofta gör ju lärarna inte det så kul.

-Often the teachers don't make it so fun.

René: - Nej, det gör de INTE.

-No, they do NOT.

Alex: -Ofta är det så här; Nu ska ni läsa en bok, läs sidan fem.

-Often it is like this; Now you should read a book, read page five.

(Alex and René, interview 1: 18)

One reading of this is that the difference between drama and other school subjects produces a gap between different ways of knowing as well as who the individual can be and become (Ball, et .al, 2012; Foucault, 1975/1991). In theoretical school subjects, education often takes place in structured classrooms with tables and chairs, and where pupils have their own place, often sitting directed toward the teacher. This spatial placement together with the organization of school education, where pupils

work individually on set tasks, can be regarded as a technique of governance and means of correct training (Foucault, 1975/1991). The desired behavior is punctuated by an observing hierarchy which operates to control the body (sit still), to be quiet, to do as one is told, and to focus on one's own knowledge acquisition and achievements. Within neo-liberal practice, these are the discursive techniques that construct and interpellate the "good student" (Ball, et al., 2012, p. 126). This, in turn, creates a sense of obligation and subjection leading to a state of compliance where subsequently some pupils may hold back on their feelings to align with the prevailing discourse of the good pupil (Foucault, 1982; Rose, 1996).

According to my reading of the data, this difference between drama and other school subjects gives rise to a tension between the contrasting educational practices, a tension that is handled through different strategies. Two such strategies appear throughout interviews: to consider them as separate and incompatible activities, or rather see such differences as something to be coped with.

The strategy to consider drama and other subjects as separate and incompatible is expressed by Alex:

Jag har drama och sen har jag skolan... Jag har inte drama och skolan
samma... Jag skiljer det.

*I have drama and then I have school... I do not have drama and school in
the same... I separate it. (Alex, interview 1: 18)*

In drama education, pupils are encouraged to express their own opinions, participate in common discussions, and to talk in front of a group. The excerpts previously provided from interviews with Sonny (p. 145) and Cay (p. 149) would seem to indicate this. In another interview, with Isa and Tim, this is perceived to give rise to a tension concerning how one is supposed to behave in drama education and during lessons in other school subjects. While there is a lot of verbal communication in drama, much talk can be considered as problematic in other lessons.

Tim: -På drama pratar vi väldigt mycket, och pratar om vad man tycker om,
ibland. Och då på andra lektioner blir det väldigt pratigt för att alla är

så bra kompisar. Och på övningar som man ska prata blir det ju bra.

[...] En vanlig lektion är att sitta tyst och ha tråkigt.

- *In drama we talk very much, and talk about what we like, sometimes.*

And then, in other lessons it gets very gabby because we all are such good friends. And in exercises where one is supposed to talk this is good. [...] An ordinary lesson is about sitting quietly and being bored.

Isa: - Man får inte säga vad man tycker. Man ska bara sitta och lyssna.

- *We may not say what we think. We should just sit and listen.* (Isa and

Tim, interview 1: 9)

To talk too much seems not to be in accordance with governing discourse for how to behave as a “good pupil”. The prevailing discourse concerning good behavior as a pupil includes knowing when to be silent (Foucault, 1975/1991, 1982; Rose, 1996). Here, colliding discourses appear between drama and ordinary school education. To be a school pupil can be seen as a continuous work of submission and mastery of the prevailing discourse (Lofors-Nyblom, 2009). This leads to an understanding that youths move between different discursive practices when they are in school (Ball, et al., 2012). According to my reading of this excerpt, the youths see such differences as something they must cope with.

In some interviews, it appears that youths handle this difference between approaches to verbal communication in another way. They say that since drama promotes a sense of courage to talk in front of others and to express one’s own opinions this can benefit oral presentations in other school subjects. (In the Swedish curriculum for compulsory school, oral presentation is highlighted both a content and a desirable capability in the subjects of Swedish and English (Lgr 11/17).)

Jag tycker att drama är som skådespeleri, och det hjälper ju dig, du står inför folk. När man vågar göra såna här roliga saker så är man inte så rädd sen att stå inför klassen.

I think that drama is like acting, and this helps you, you stand in front of people. When you dare to do such fun things, then you are not so afraid to stand in front of the class. (Nenne, interview I: 12)

According to what is expressed in some interviews, there are also different norms among the youths concerning who one can be.

Det finns särskilda normer bland ungdomar för hur man ska vara, men i drama får man "vara sig själv".

There are specific norms among youths for how one should be, but in drama, one is allowed "to be oneself". (Isa, interview 1: 9)

Isa's statement that "one is allowed 'to be oneself' in drama", might be understood as somewhat enabling: that in drama education, through a process of acting in role participants are able to act and express themselves in various ways, and thereby not simply according to one norm. This reading relates to an earlier excerpt from an interview with Sonny (p. 145) that, when acting in role, the subject tries to be someone else and so sees things from different perspectives.

The acting in role implies a double consciousness about oneself and the role, and, with this, the possibility of seeing oneself from another perspective (Eriksson, 2009). In the process of dramatic action, participants simultaneously see others act in various ways. This, in turn, might lead to a new understanding both of oneself and of how others can be. Based on a post-constructionist approach, there is no essential self, rather who the subject is and can be takes place as a relational process, so that "[...] the effects of the composition and re-composition of forces, practices and relations that strive or operate to render human beings into diverse subject forms" (Rose, 1996, p. 171) occurs.

This reasoning also applies to René's and Alex's points: that they perceive they have changed as a relational doing together with classmates:

René: - Vår klass är olik andra klasser. Vi vågar ju vara oss själva. Det kanske inte är så många som hållit på med drama innan, men efteråt så...

- Our class is different from other classes. We dare to be ourselves. There may not be so many that have had drama before, but afterwards so...

Alex: - Vi kan ju vara med vem som helst. Om man ser på andra klasser så kanske man är en grupp här och en grupp där. Vi är ju en hel stor grupp.

- *We can be with anyone. If you look at other classes, maybe there is a group here and a group there. We are a whole big group.*

René: - Ja, vi är alltid tillsammans. Fast, alla tycker vi är jättetöntiga. Men det är bara coolt.

- *Yes, we are always together. Though everyone thinks we are really dorky. But this is just cool.*

Susanne: - Vad menar du med 'alla'?

- *What do you mean by 'everyone'?*

René: - Vi, dramaklassen, är töntklassen, för vi vågar vara oss själva.

- *We, the drama class, are the dorky class, because we dare to be ourselves.*

Alex: - Istället för att göra samma saker som alla andra.

- *Instead of doing the same thing as everyone else.*

Susanne: - Så om man inte gör som alla andra då ses man som en tönt?

- *So if you don't do like everyone else, you are seen as a dork?*

Alex: - Ja, fast egentligen så är man ju inte det.

- *Yes, but in fact you are not.*

René: - När jag börjat i den här klassen har jag förändrats väldigt mycket...

Jag vågar mer vara mig själv här... Jag vågar mer säga vad jag tycker.

- *When I started in this class I have changed a lot... I dare more to be myself, here... I dare more to say what I think.*

Alex: - Det har förändrat mig väldigt mycket. Jag har typ hittat mig själv.

Jag var aldrig med i gruppen i min förra skola. Här känner jag mig mer inne i gruppen.

- *It has changed me a lot. I've like found myself. I was never in a group in my previous school. Here I feel more inside the group.*

René: - Vi stöter inte ut någon.

- *We don't push anyone out.*

Alex: - Alla är olika personligheter.

- *All are different personalities. (Alex and René, interview I: 18)*

One reading of Alex's and René's articulations is that their view of differences between classes contributes to a notion of consolidation of the group's norms and, with this, the creation of otherness. Another reading is that the differences experienced concerning who the subject can be, both within the drama class and

other classes contributes to a state of consciousness and understanding of the different potential ways to be and become: further, that each subject within a group both affects, and is affected by the interaction with others. Such consciousness might also open up and entertain a certain preparedness to meet with diversity and otherness (Foucault, 1991).

5.1.3 Differences between locally formulated intentions and pupils' perceived learning

The division between drama and other academic subjects also concerns a question as to which kinds of knowledge are produced in drama education compared with other school subjects. According to the interviews, participants appear not to make any direct connections between drama education and other subjects, and this applies to all the three schools. In contrast, according to drama teachers there is an intention that drama and other school subjects should be linked and so promote learning across the subjects.

To exemplify what this difference can contribute to in practice, I refer back to the foreshadowed working with detective stories as a literature genre in Tallenskolan (p. 140). In one interview, it was said that this work had been collaboratively planned by the drama teacher and Swedish teacher. During the introduction of this work in drama, the drama teacher mentioned the connection with pupils' previous work in this genre in the school subject of Swedish. The teacher also declared that the intention was to make use of previous knowledge relating to the genre. However, there was no collaboration between teachers within the classroom. As mentioned earlier, there is very little time provided for teachers to plan together and no time for the realization of collaborative working in teaching.

During the interviews with pupils, nobody mentioned or made the connection that it was about a detective story when they spoke of their experiences and learning in drama during this period. Nor did they verbally make any connections between their work in drama and work previously conducted in Swedish. Rather, what they talked about were their experiences and learning around dramatic acting in role on a more general level, and around knowing concerning collaboration and communication. From my observations of classroom practice, there do not appear to be any occasions

where pupils and teacher reflect together on what characterizes the genre, or how such may be adapted to the dramatic form.

This might lead to a situation in which the theoretical and practical components of subject matter are unwittingly kept apart, which, in turn, might imply that pupils do not make connections between creative, embodied experiences in drama, and similar content within other school subjects.

While it could be suggested that, during interviews, participants wanted to separate their experiences of drama and learning in other school subjects, speaking only of things that are specific to drama. Another reading is that connections across different school subjects were not made explicit for pupils within and through the practice of drama. Thus, it might be suggested that drama teachers perceived that connections between form and content are united, and therefore not possible to highlight separately. This concurs with the romantic idea that drama is a wholly sensory and emotional experiencing that should not be broken apart theoretically (Sæbø, 2009).

The corollary is that in order for connections to be made, relations between different aspects of knowing and understanding a subject matter should be made explicit for pupils (Cole, 2011). Explicit knowledge is knowledge that we are conscious about, while implicit knowledge is about tacit knowledge that we use intuitively (see for example Ahlstrand, 2014; Courtney, 1990). To make it explicit can be seen as a new way of knowing a phenomenon, in that it adds new aspects (Carlgren, 2010a, 2010b). To articulate and critically analyze what we know, this has to be made explicit.

This might be done for example through reflection together about a common experience in drama. Reflection can be seen as a temporal point of (verbal) revisiting an activity and a possibility to examine it together (Sternudd, 2000, 2017). It can be related to Dewey's (1916/2007, 1933) argument that the verbal formulation of experience can lead to new perspectives, and further to Deleuze's (1968/2004) thought that concept and practice are entwined and working together. However, making something explicit is not just about verbalizing experiences and thoughts, as this could imply foreclosing prematurely on predetermined truths (Deleuze, 1968/2004). Instead, it involves an exploration together through the articulation of knowledge and the various ways to understand this. This is not to suggest that

something must first be experienced and then conceptualized. As Deleuze (ibid.) argues, concept and practice are working together on the same immanent plane.

A separation of different ways of knowing often produces fragmented knowledge, or in other words, the incidence of divided practices (Foucault 1975/1991). Thereby, the organization of education produces a striated space (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980/1988; Semetsky, 2009). It can be seen as striated in the sense that separate aspects of a content both come into and drop out of focus in different academic subjects, because the connections between these are not always constructed. This might prevent the intention towards polyvocality of ways of knowing differently.

5.1.4 “We get no grades in drama”

In Swedish schools, the prevailing orientation towards results contributes to a focus on grades. As mentioned earlier, for each of the compulsory school subjects in the national curriculum there are formulated knowledge requirements. The achievements of these form the basis for the pupil’s grades. Thus, pupil’s success is defined in relation to academic performance, measured through formal grades. Against this backdrop, the data suggests that the hegemony of school subjects. With graded outcomes, the status of drama education may be affected, even though (or because) drama is not assessed by grades. In this section, I now turn to how grades in other school subjects may impact on drama education in school.

5.1.4.1 Engagement vis-à-vis split focus

In one interview only was the difference between education in drama and learning in other school subjects identified as being explicitly related to grades:

Jag tycker att drama är som skådespeleri, och det hjälper ju dig, du står inför folk. När man vågar göra såna här roliga saker så är man inte så rädd sen att stå inför klassen, för det är ganska stor skillnad att göra det här eller inför hela klassen och läraren. Jag tänker att här är det bara roligt, men det finns säkert ett syfte. Och när vi ska ha presentationer i klassen då gäller det ju betyg också.

I think that drama is like acting, and this helps you very much, you stand in front of people. When you dare to do such fun things, then you are not so

afraid to stand in front of the class, because it is quite a difference to do it here or in front of the whole class and the teacher. Here I think it is just fun, but there is presumably a purpose. And when we are going to have presentations in the class then it is about grades as well. (Nenne, interview I: 12)

When Nenne says “teacher” this seems to refer to one who teaches a school subject involving the requirement of a graded presentation. One reading of this is that such grades assessments produce a certain type of pressure oriented towards performance, in which notions of achievement produce a split focus. The quoted statement can be understood as that there is a difference between educational activities that are connected with assessment by formal grades and drama education more often characterized by learning because it is fun. This is related to an earlier excerpt from the same interview, where Nenne expresses that it is not difficult to learn something that one is very interested in (p. 150). In this way, the experience of ‘fun’ is related to engagement, to have a total focus in the doing here-and-now (Bundy, 2003; Dewey, 1934/2005; Semetsky, 2010).

According to what appears in the data, it seems that tests assessed by formal grades within another academic subject might have an impact on the focused attention in drama educational situations. This relates to Foucault’s (1980) reasoning that components related to different events are active in a singular event, in this case that a test in another subject impacts on the concentration on dramatic acting here-and-now. For example, Joni tells that her worry about a test might imply that she is not attentive on the drama activity.

[...] man tänker ofta på ett annat sätt än vad man gör på de vanliga lektionerna, tycker jag. Så om man till exempel... Man vet att man ska ha ett prov, då tänker man på det ”Shit, jag har inte pluggat!” [...] och man hör inte för man tänker för mycket på det. Det är inte samma sak för man får ju inte betyg i drama.

[...] you often think in another way than you do in the ordinary lessons, I think. So if you for example... You know that you will have a test, than you think about it “Shit, I have not studied!” [...] and you do not listen because

you are thinking too much about it. It is not the same thing since you are not given grades in drama. (Joni, interview II: 12)

From observations of practice, it also appears that when a test is given priority in a school subject, this can induce a split focus or distraction within a nearby drama lesson. In Tallenskolan, drama lessons lasted for 50 minutes and afterwards the class had a short break before moving to a different subject in the next lesson. During one drama lesson, the class was divided into groups that were writing different scenes of a script. I was sitting close to one group that was working in a separate classroom:

A group with five pupils sit around a table and are talking about the actual scene, while one of them writes down the ideas in the document on *Drive*. The youths discuss different ideas about what the role characters will do, how they will interact, how this scene can lead forward to the next one, and what message this particular scene might have. The ideas and associations were moving in different directions, but were constantly circulating around the dramatic action. All the youths participate actively in the discussion. They come up with ideas, respond to and further evolve the others' idea. They give ideas of how replicas and instructions can be formulated in the script. The writer is active in the discussion, and both express ideas and ask for advice on written formulations.

About ten minutes before the end of the lesson one of them say something about the test in the subsequent lesson of the school day. Participants begin to ask each other if they have been studying for this test. The test begins to be one of the matters participants talk about. Successively more and more of the youths enter into chat about the test. The writer asks for a clarification on how to write a replica, and thereafter turns off the computer. Towards the end of the lesson, all participants in the group only talk about the test. When the lesson ends, they rush away together while continuing to talk about it. (From transcript from field notes, 24 October 2014.)

According to what I could experience through my affective and emplaced engagement in the situation, when everyone was actively working with the script there was an intensely productive climate. Approaching the end of the lesson, however, the focus for attention gradually started to shift towards the test. As pupils

left the classroom, most seemed to be mentally already present in the forthcoming activity.

One reading is that towards the end of the lesson the youths simply started to get tired of sitting and working with the script and therefore began talking about the test. This is related to statements in interviews that it is boring to just sit and work (see p. x). If so, to begin to talk about something else can be seen as a form of resistance to continue to engage with writing the script.

Another reading is that the test preoccupies their thoughts regardless, and so they inevitably lose concentration on their drama work. Of course, it might be a combination of both things. In line with Deleuze's reasoning, this might be understood as the test occupying the educational space, in that focus and intentionality "is directed towards doing well in examinations" (Cole, 2011, p. 39). To perform well becomes a matter of producing good results in measurable tests (Ball, 2013; Foucault, 1975/1991). In this way, examinations can be seen to dominate pupils' educational experience, and, perhaps more adversely, discard or even prevent forms of learning that not are predictable and/or possible to regulate. This relates to Foucault's (1975/1991) reasoning that examination is a powerful technique of subjection, normalization and differentiation. It is about normalization in that it directs the subject's focus for attention on certain forms of knowledge, prescriptions and pre-specified outcomes. It is about differentiation in that it produces a hierarchical categorization of individuals. As Foucault (1975/1991, p. 192) argues, examinations thereby lead to the "fabrication of [...] individuality".

It can also be related to Deleuze's (1968/2004) thought that if knowledge is limited to preset, standardized goals of achievement, it can further serve to reduplicate existing knowledge, about 'more of the same', or, producing no new knowledge. This is to suggest that the event is closed down (Olsson, 2008). In the example above, the subsequent test infiltrated the drama lesson and so interfered with engagement, progress and continuity.

5.1.4.2 Free to choose?

The tension between academic subjects that are formally assessed and drama where grades are not given, appears most clearly in Tallenskolan. In this school, as a minor part of the time available for the "pupil's own choice" study stations (*studiestugor*) are an option. A *studiestuga* is a time-limited space where a specialist teacher in a

specific theoretical subject is available to give pupils help and support. At the times *studiestugor* are offered, pupils can choose to attend one if, and when, they feel they need. Because it is optional, it is not compulsory. The times for *studiestugor* coincide sometimes with drama lessons because this is also a “pupil’s own choice”.

During a period in which tests were being taken place in various school subjects in Tallenskolan, on one occasion upon visiting the class, only four pupils were attending the drama lesson. Most were participating in study stations (*studiestugor*) in different subject areas for which they required support to prepare for a test. On this occasion, the possibility to attend a *studiestuga* was offered in several school subjects but not announced in advance, thus denying the drama teacher the opportunity to prepare alternative arrangements for the lesson. This can be seen as a dilemma for a subject that is not compulsory.

The drama lesson is just going to start, and four pupils are sitting in the drama room together with the drama teacher. The pupils have just said that all the peers are attending different *studiestugor*. The drama teacher initiates a discussion about where the class is in the working process with the actual theatre performance, and what the participating pupils now can do.

One of the pupils (Karol) then says:

- Actually I need to attend the *studiestuga* in (*mention the subject*). It is okey if I leave now?

The teacher says that it’s okey, and the pupil leaves. Now there are three pupils in the drama lesson, and they decide to remain there. One of them said that she wanted to stay and the others agreed. (Transcript from field notes, 26 November 2014.)

It appears that in order to cope with tests in compulsory school subjects, pupils are sometimes compromised, for it is not possible to choose in accordance with one’s interests and desires. Karol, who first attended the drama lesson but then decided to leave, appeared trapped between his desire to attend the lesson, on the one hand, and the competing need for support to prepare for a test on the other, this being a test that would clearly impact his grade within the academic subject.

This scenario can be explained through Foucault’s (1982, p. 221) reasoning that the exercise of power and the subjects’ freedom are interconnected, which is to say that without the possibility to choose different directions “power would be equivalent

to a physical determination”. As mentioned earlier, two guiding principles for neoliberalism are individual choice and competition. The subject is free to choose, but also has the responsibility for both success and failure. Related to the school, it may be about whether the pupil succeeds or fails to achieve desirable results. This can be seen as a form of governance in which the field of action is constructed by putting in place possible outcomes leading to the individual governing herself in order to comply with prevailing requirements (Foucault, 1975/1991, 1988). Thus, neoliberal discourse produces a priority of time on the acquisition of knowledge that is formally graded, which, in turn, governs the possible choices for individual pupils.

In line with Deleuze and Guattari’s (1980/1988) reasoning about supple lines, this can be understood as a form of governing that is masked: that, on the one hand, it is possible (in this case) to choose drama education, but on the other, there is an irresistible urge to meet the demands of academic subjects, which through graded assessment are considered more important. Deleuze and Guattari argue that a danger of the supple line is power in that it implies a striving for control, stability, and predictability. “The danger of power is its betraying suppleness that disguises its will to stop every line of flight that tries to break through.” (Olsson, 2008, p. 98.) It indicates that the prevailing neoliberal discourse produces a hierarchy of high-status knowledge and priority of ways of knowing. This produces a subordinate position for drama as a subject that can be chosen but without compulsory status or formal assessment.

5.2 The physical space

In this section, the mapping foregrounds how physical spaces contribute to educational practices of drama. All three schools in the present study have dedicated drama rooms. That these schools have drama rooms tells us that the teachers are drama specialists. They know the importance of an adapted educational space for drama, and that senior management support this requirement. To provide a designated drama room, a space that opens up a variety of activities, might allow for different ways of knowing. As Franks (2015a, p. 243) says, the physical environment “might permeate and inflect perceptions and subsequent actions”.

5.2.1 Rooms for drama

In the following, I provide a brief description of the rooms used for drama within the participating schools, along with other physical spaces available for drama education. This is based on documented data from interviews with drama teachers and also collected through observations, together with my memories from emplaced engagement.

Aspskolan is located in an old building built of brick with large and high windows, situated in the central part of a big town. We pass the small, asphalted schoolyard and enter the building, into a stairwell with marble stairs worn down by many years of use. On each floor, large corridors lead to the classrooms. The drama room is located on the top floor. It is an ordinary classroom that is furnished as a drama room. Since it is located high up in the building, it is not possible to look from the outside through the windows which cover almost a whole wall. The only door to the room leads to a corridor. Curtains can be drawn over the windows. Curtains can also be used to divide the room into two parts, or be used as a theatre curtain. In the room, there is a cabinet with drama materials. The furniture is two tables, a drawer unit on wheels, and chairs stacked against one wall. Beside these, the floor space is empty. When the pupils are actively working divided in small groups, the corridor outside the room is often used. The corridor is also used as a passage by pupils in other classes that have lessons nearby. If required, a nearby assembly hall is available to use. This is a large room with solid, tiered seating, and a part of the room has a flat empty floor space.

Cypresskolan is situated in an area with a mixed dwelling, and is surrounded by a grove and a grass field. The school is located in a pavilion building built in the late 1950s, consisting of longhouses. The drama room is located on the first floor, at one end of a building, and is the only specially designed drama room in this study. This room is slightly larger than an ordinary classroom. The furniture comprises a cabinet for materials, chairs stacked against one wall, a low bench and some folding tables. There are also three large boxes and some folding screens. In a corner, there is a small working place for the drama teacher. The open space in the middle of the room is rather big and can be used as a stage lighted with spotlights in the ceiling. One door leads to a stairwell, one door leads to a smaller space with cabinets for materials, and a third door leads to a group room that can also be used as a makeup

lodge. When required, groups can work within the drama room, the connecting group room, the library, a corridor and/or an occasionally empty classroom. For final rehearsals and the performance of theatre plays, an assembly hall in the neighborhood outside the school is used.

Tallenskolan consists of several buildings close to each other, built in the middle of the 1900s. The drama room is located in a separate building together with rooms for crafts and visual arts. These rooms are connected by a corridor. When I first visited the school, the drama room was situated in a room the size of an ordinary classroom. On part of the floor, a removable stage floor was placed. The rest of the floor was occupied with a cabinet for material, chairs and a table with a computer. For the school year 2014/2015, the room for drama was moved to a smaller room to accommodate a compulsory school subject in a standard sized room. The new drama room was originally used as a bigger group room. The windows in this room are placed high up close to the ceiling. Two doors lead out, one to the corridor and the other to a room for crafts. A stage floor occupies part of the floor and beside this is only a place for chairs for a whole class. Surrounding classrooms, designed for crafts and the visual arts are used for small group work. For final rehearsals and performance of theatre plays, the school's assembly hall is used.

5.2.2 Activity spaces

The physical spaces are *activity spaces* (Kirkeby, 2006) they can encourage or limit activities (see also chapter 3.4). An example of a high coded space where the design and objects limit the use is Aspskolan's assembly hall with solid, tiered seating, which allows people to sit in the same direction, but cannot be changed for other kinds of activities.

Other activity spaces are more open for different kind of activities in that they can be easily adapted to given situations, and this applies to all three drama rooms. They provide an almost empty floor space, and this opens up the potential for drama exercises and plays involving physical movements and/or for improvisations. In the data appear drama exercises and plays with a focus on group process and/or theatre techniques. However, in all participating classes, the main part of drama work consisted of dramatization in role in a fictive context. The drama rooms' interior provided possibilities to create different spaces depending on the actual drama

activity. They are *smooth spaces* in that they open up for movements and can be transformed depending on types of activity (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988; Johansson, 2015). Simultaneously there are limitations regarding what can take place in the room because it contains *striated* aspects. The second drama room in Tallenskolan is an example of a room that contains smooth and striated aspects, in that the only furniture are stage floor and chairs, and it can therefore be easily changed, but the room is very small and will not allow activities with extensive movement.

In these schools, there are drama rooms that open up for physical expressions, but in all the participating classes, the work with dramatizations was often realized in small groups. In order to provide separate working spaces for each group, other places were used in addition to the designated drama rooms. These places, corridors, other classrooms etc., can be described as striated rooms since their interior delimits the function to certain activities and cannot easily be changed. This affects what it is possible to do in the drama activity. The practice of drama thus collides with the otherwise educational practice in that drama education is not contained within its own physical space. This relates to Foucault's (1975/1991) notion of a division of activities in physical spaces to enable regulation and control, where control includes that of the body and voice, for example to speak loudly in a contained environment.

In the following, I highlight three examples from the data to illustrate the functionality of physical spaces as a co-producing factor for how drama activity is realized in practice. The examples are about group works occurring in a library, a corridor and a drama room.

5.2.2.1 The library

In Cypresskolan, the library was sometimes available for group work. It is a room of the same size as an ordinary classroom, comprising a variety of furniture: bookshelves, some tables, chairs and a sofa. This offers an undisturbed room, and according to video-recordings, notes and memories from my emplaced engagement, pupils were comfortable with staying in the room. They said that they wanted to work in this room.

The function of furniture in the library is coded as places to sit and read. There were low tables and chairs with soft pads. In line with Kirkeby's (2006) reasoning, what the furniture "can be used for" is limited to certain, designated functions. In the situation highlighted below, the furniture was used in the obvious literal ways, and also symbolically for the fictive context.

They are seven pupils working together with a dramatization. The class is working with different genres, and each group adapts the traditional fairy tale *Red riding hood and the wolf* to a given genre. This group is creating a thriller, and has on earlier occasions decided how to adapt the plot and insert roles for everyone. Now they shall put together all parts into a dramatization. Initially they negotiate how to arrange the stage. The entire group are actively participating in the decisions about and arrangements of the stage. The negotiation of arrangements of the stage and the symbolic meaning of furniture takes place through verbal communication and also practical arrangements. One ending of the room is used, and they decide to use an existing table and chairs as the home for Red riding hood and her family (mother and one older sister). In the middle of the stage, they put two chairs to symbolize grandmother's bed in her home. A small empty space beside is used as the wood. (From transcription and notes from observation, 18 November 2014.)

That the pupils were comfortable in the room and could work without being disturbed may have contributed to the engagement in relation both to each other and in the creation of the dramatization. They communicated both verbally and by practical arrangements, and it seems that they all participated in the creation of the physical and dramatic space. It can be understood that they connected with each other and the dramatic context as a relational doing. 'To connect to' is to be present here-and-now in the common, listen and respond to each other. This may lead to the creation of trust (Bundy, 2003; Nicholson, 2002).

In turn, it may have contributed to a feeling of freedom to use exaggerated and/or high voices. It also seems that the spatial limitation for physical movements was compensated with an expressive use of voices.

During the acting, they stop each other several times, and give advices about how to express an action with body and voice. The space limits the possibilities to use big gestures and movements, since the furniture takes up most of the space. This spatial limitation suppresses the gestures and movements, and also the use of voices. The peers that give advice say “higher” or show with gestures and voices how the action can be expressed. This is illustrated with slightly more exaggerated gestures and with a much more exaggerated and high voice. The use of voice is more in focus than corporeal expressions. (From transcription and notes from observation, 18 November 2014.)

This can be understood in term of the possibility of working together as a group without being disturbed contributes to smooth aspects in that it opened up for the creation of trust and the more extensive use of voice. While the limited physical space did not allow for expansive movements, the undisturbed room created a space for varied voice expressions. As Fischer-Litche (2004/2008, p. 125) points out, the use of voice is related to “corporeality, spatiality, and tonality”. The use of voice is a corporeal act, and is heard through space. Tonality is about the relation between used tones (rhythm, force and so on) when the voice is employed. Tonality and the use of words interact in and through verbal expression.

5.2.2.2 The corridor

An example of a space where striated aspects appear to dominate is in the corridor in the following excerpt, from an observation of a group work in Aspskolan:

A group with six youths is working with a dramatization of part of the story given by the drama teacher. They are sitting and standing around a table and two benches in the corridor. Verbally they negotiate who shall take which role, and thereafter they talk about how to illustrate the plot. On two occasions, some youths from other classes pass in the corridor. On these occasions, all participants in this group lower their voices and look at the other people. When they have verbally decided on the plot and are alone in the corridor they start to dramatize. All of them use small gestures and movements as well as a conversational tone. Objects are illustrated through mimicking and no one fetches any material from the drama room. During

the dramatic acting, the participants looked around now and then. (From transcription and notes from observation, 3 December 2013.)

The corridor was used by pupils in various classes, and it was not possible to know who would pass and when. In this sense, it was not possible to know exactly by whom one was being observed or when. When the participants in this group lower their voices and give attention to the people that passed, their bodies and voices expressed that they were exposed to others' observation. The dramatization was interrupted and their focus of attention was directed to the actual context. That they were looking around now and then can be understood as them wanting to be sure that no one saw them. This seems to have contributed to the fact that youths within the group were vigilant about what was going on in the corridor, and so controlled their voice and corporeal expressions. As Foucault (1975/1991) argues, the spatial organization of school buildings enables the monitoring of pupils. That one can be observed, and perhaps without consciously knowing, contributes to a form of self-policing in which the subject internalises the desired behavior. In this regard, the physical space can contribute to the suppression of corporeal and voice expression. It is reasonable to suggest this might also suppress the process of exploration of a fictive situation through acting in role in drama.

5.2.2.3 The drama room

The drama room in Cypresskolan provides a large empty floor space and objects that have the potential to be used in different ways, it is thus a smooth space. The following example illustrates how the space can open up for the creation of dramatic action. On the same day as the example above from the library in Cypresskolan, in a different class, pupils were adapting *Red riding hood and the wolf* to a specific genre, and the group I followed were creating a detective story. They were alone in the drama room and knew that the other groups were working in other room during a specific time of the lesson.

The group of five people is working in the drama room. Earlier they had decided about the role characters and about how to adapt the fairy tale to the given genre. The work now starts with the arrangement of the stage design. At the start, one of the youths together with the drama teacher search for

useful objects in the cabinet for material. Then the teacher left the room and the pupil put the things in a corner. The others move the three large, rectangular boxes to the middle of the play place. While they are moving the boxes, in low voices they discuss how and where to put them. Simultaneously they negotiate what the boxes will symbolize. One box will be the bed for grandmother, and one pupil fetches two pillows and puts them on the box. They help each other to put the other boxes on the long side, in order to create a space behind. In this version, the wolf is transformed to a villain who stuns and locks grandmother in a cabinet, and they discuss how the cabinet can be positioned behind these boxes. On one side of the play space and at some distance from the boxes, a folding screen is covered with green fabric to symbolize the wood. They also decide how to use some of the smaller objects. While they are arranging the objects, they negotiate what they will symbolize and how to use them. It appears that one in the group, Nevin, was not present in the last drama lesson, and he now takes part in the process of decision-making, coming up with ideas.

As an adaptation to a detective story, the hunter is replaced by two police officers that search for the villain. They search all over the space and when they have found him, he is taken away off stage, to the prison.

[...]

Suddenly all the group members stop the dramatic acting, gather together and talk with eager voices. (*It is not possible to hear what they say.*) Then together they rapidly move towards the teacher's working place on the other side of the room, and one of them takes paper and writes something. Then together they go back to the stage. Someone puts the paper on the box placed on the long side. On the paper is written 'prison'.

The youths thereafter collectively improvise the last scene in the dramatization. It is a look forward when the villain is in prison, and says that he regrets his deeds. The boxes that earlier symbolized a cabinet now symbolizes the cell wall behind which the villain is caged. (From transcription and notes from observation, 18 November 2014.)

The fictive space was created during the practical arrangement and verbal negotiations. The youths arranged the boxes, folding screen and objects simultaneously as they negotiated their symbolic meaning. They moved around and occupied the entire space with their bodies. It can be understood that the dramatic

action was successively and collectively elaborated in detail, and that the physical space and objects helped inspire this. Nevin, who had not participated during the previous drama lesson, was introduced to the work while they began to arrange the stage and was soon actively participating in creating the dramatization. During this arrangement, they all seemed to be intensely focused on the common working.

During the whole situation, they used rather low voices, and it is not possible to hear on the video-recording how the idea came up to transform the box from being a cabinet to a prison. But it appears that the idea led to everyone's commitment because they stopped the dramatic action and together went to fetch the paper. The look forward is a fictive move in time and place, and adds a final twist.

It seems that the possibility using the entire empty space and objects that might easily symbolize different things contributed to the creation of a stage and opened up an exploration of actions within the fictive situation. In addition, the verbal negotiation of what the objects would symbolize contributed to the active creation of meaning through a transformational space (see Fischer-Lichte, 2004/2008; Franks, 2015a).

Taken together, the functionality of the physical space in connection with the possibility of working undisturbed, undoubtedly contributed to the use of corporeal and voice expressions through dramatic action, and for the focus on the common work. It is thus clear that physical space has particular significance for how learning in and through drama can be manifested and done.

5.3 Summarizing reflections

The sources used as data describe different approaches to drama education. Through websites, drama is presented primarily as an instrument for the achievement of results in other academic subjects. According to drama teachers' statements and written documents, drama is an art-based subject with an intrinsic value, as well as being a resource for knowledge creation in different subject areas and promoting general competences. There is an expressed intention that drama should combine and collaborate with other academic subjects, but yet in practice, there is no time provided for team-teaching across subjects.

It appears that pupils tend not to draw connections between different school subjects, but instead perceive a difference between drama and other subject areas. Drama is thus different because it encapsulates a form of collective and bodily experiencing, and expressing and knowing through dramatic acting. Accordingly, drama appears to promote general competences while simultaneously promoting new understanding both of who oneself and others can be and become. No one expressed the view that the absence of formal grades in drama adversely affected learning. On the contrary, it seems that graded assessment in other school subjects can produce a split focus insofar as the individual pays attention to performance and learning elsewhere thus rendering them less than wholly present in the process here-and-now.

The differences between drama and the rest of the school seem to lead to an understanding among pupils that during school hours there is inevitable movement between the converging requirements and possibilities.

6. “As if”

In this chapter, I identify which learning processes are made possible and manifest themselves in concrete drama educational practices. This has been undertaken in order to establish what characterizes drama education when realized within compulsory school in Sweden. A focus is also placed on how different components work together in a drama event and contribute to learning. The components standing out as significant for learning in and through drama are dramatic acting in role, as well as improvisation and creation together in a collective process. These recur frequently in data from both observations and interviews. In this chapter, I emphasize dramatic acting in role, and in the following, the emphasis lies on improvisation. In both these chapters, the focus also lies on creating as a collective process.

As I mentioned earlier, a point of departure in this study is that learning takes place simultaneously as an interior and as an exterior process. Therefore, throughout the chapter data from observations of drama educational situations are juxtaposed with excerpts from interviews where youths talk about experiences and perceptions of learning in and through drama. In the interviews, the youths then particularly emphasize dramatic acting in role. They rarely refer to a specific role, but rather to their experiences more generally of acting in various roles within drama in school. It can be understood as that role work is distinctive for learning processes in drama education, and this will be discussed in this chapter. Acting in a role is carried out within dramatic actions created together by the participants and therefore such processes of creation are also discussed in relation to learning.

6.1 Dramatic acting “as if”

Dramatic acting “as if” relates to both the fictive context and the acting in role. The fictive context is made up of chosen content and the participants’ experiences, perceptions and ideas (Courtney, 1990, 1995; O’Toole, 1992). The dramatic action and the role are created as an interrelated process. The acting within the fictive context includes exterior expressions, and interior emotions and thoughts. The “as if”-process involves sensory experiencing, emotions and cognition. A conscious use of corporeal movements and gestures in order to express fictive actions and emotions

can evoke an experience of what a situation might be like (Baldwin, 2012; Courtney, 1995).

Dramatic action is carried out in a context that is simultaneously physical and social, and fictive. The actual context includes social interplay between the participants. As Courtney (1995, p. 122) points out, “interaction with others, as in dramatic activities, assists emotions that positively affect motivation”. This points to the fact that the social climate takes place as part of the drama practice, and is a condition for learning.

In this section, examples from different works with dramatic acting based on given stories are used, and in the subsequent section 6.2, I use one example involving forum play. I have chosen the examples because they illuminate aspects that appear specific for how learning takes place in drama education. In the previous chapter, I highlighted that participating youths acknowledge drama as different from the rest of the school education and, by using these examples, I investigate how it is different.

6.1.1 Working frames

In the examples, drama education involved creating a dramatized interpretation based on a story, creating a dramatized adaption of a given literature genre, or the creation of a forum play based on a theme. The example involving creating a dramatized adaption of a given literature genre comes from work with the fairy tale *Red riding hood and the wolf* presented in the previous chapter (p. 142). The example about creating a dramatized interpretation comes from when one of the classes over a period of some lessons worked with the story *Mutt and Jeff*¹²¹ by H. C. Andersen. The drama teacher told the story for the whole group, and thereafter the pupils were given the task in small groups to create a dramatization of any part of it.

In all the examples used here, the drama teacher introduced the actual content and working form in the whole group. The pupils then were divided into small groups to create a dramatization which was then presented to the whole group. The content, form and structure of work, and the task given to the small groups together constituted a working frame within which the participants could explore different

¹²¹ The Swedish name of the tale is *Storklas och Lillklas*.

understandings and ways of expressing the dramatic action. Earlier in the thesis (section 1.4.2), the concept of “frame” was defined as an agreed, fictive setting, and I now widen its signification to also cover these preconditions for the creation of dramatizations.

As I mentioned in section 2.2.5, group work seems to have a weak position within school education in Sweden. However, in drama education, it is frequently used for creation and exploration of dramatic action. The youths expressed in interviews that group work is significant for learning in drama, because in a small group they dare to do new things.

Jag tycker att det mesta är kul att göra i drama. För man i små grupper, och då vågar man göra saker... och man samarbetar. Jag har lärt mig att samarbeta med andra personer som jag aldrig trott att jag skulle kunna samarbeta med, med alla i den här gruppen. [...] Jag har lärt mig att improvisera. Att våga och inte vara så blyg.

I think most in drama is fun to do. Because you are in small groups and then you dare to do things... and you collaborate. I have learned to collaborate with other people who I never thought I could collaborate with, with everyone in this group. [I have learned to improvise. To dare and not be so shy. (Deniz, interview I: 11)

Deniz’s statement indicates that to dare to express oneself in dramatic acting is interrelated with the social interplay between peers. When working in small groups, all participants are divided into groups that are working in different places. Through negotiation and improvisation in a role, the youths explore the given material and successively create a dramatization. The process has its focus on experiencing and trying new expressions and successively moves to a focus on the presentation of the dramatization (see Bolton, 1984). My reading of the data is that this contributes to the participants in small groups daring to experiment, and to plunge into the dramatic acting here-and-now. To dare is also connected to *trust*. Trust between drama participants is necessary if they will “feel safe enough to experiment” (Nicholson, 2002, p. 85). Thereby, the creation of a dramatization and social interplay can be seen as interdependent processes. It is not the work in small group per se, but

possibilities to experiment in connection with social interplay that contribute to a focused attention on the common creation.

I smågrupper fokuserar man bara på vad man gör, inte på sig själv.

In small groups, you just focus on what you do, not on yourself. (Chris, interview I: 35)

According to the data from observations, the drama activities were organized as work in whole group, in small groups and in pairs. Opportunities to collaborate with all the peers were provided through different group constellations in each new drama activity in small groups. All the participating drama teachers expressed the view that they have as a point of departure that everyone in the class at some occasion should work together with everyone else in the class. A purpose was that everyone should be able to work with everyone else. As one of the drama teachers said in an interview, a purpose with experiences of working with different peers was to promote opportunities for encounters with different experiences and perspectives. “Learning how human beings act and re-act” can take place through encounters with different peers in different constellations, in whole class, in pairs, and in small groups (interview with drama teacher, 28th November 2014). According to what appears in the data, the drama teachers actively supported the pupils’ drama work in small groups, and this will be further evolved in section 6.1.5.

6.1.2 Engagement

As I mentioned earlier (p. 94), engagement is created as an encounter between the subject’s desire and the object to learn, and is a prerequisite for learning. In order to engage in a dramatic action the participants have to “agree to operate reciprocally, and to do so on the same “as if” level” (Courtney, 1990, p. 32). My reading of data is that the engagement in the dramatic action “as if” is often done in the negotiation about the dramatic action and roles, the practical arrangement of the space, and the acting in role. The following is an example of how this can be done in the beginning of the working process with the story *Mutt and Jeff*, in one of the small groups:

The group consists of three people, Senja, Adan and Lior. They stand together and talk about which parts of the story they will dramatize, and

who shall take which dramatic role. This is a verbal negotiation where all the participants are taking an active part. They give different suggestions about how they can construct the plot dramaturgically, and that he/she can take a particular role. During this negotiation, they frequently confirm and build on others' suggestions by saying for example: "Yes. And then we can do like this." and "And I can be (*mentions a particular role*)". After a short while, it is decided which part of the story will be dramatized and which role each of the participants will take. Without being verbally agreed in advance, they start to fetch sleeping mats from the other side of the room, and arrange the play space, with chairs and with sleeping mats placed on the floor. Their suggestions about the arrangement are done both verbally and by placing objects. Everyone take an active and lively part in the arrangement. Successively they all enter into the dramatic acting in roles. (From transcription from video recording and field notes, 25 March 2014.)

That the youths confirmed and built on others' suggestions in relation to role taking can be understood on one level as them being open to and accepting others' ideas, on another level as the given story is not open for a variety of alternatives. The initial verbal negotiation lasted for just a short while, and the main focus is on who shall have which role. My reading of this is that the role taking was perceived as significant but having a specific role is not necessarily as important. A reason for this can be that the story contained certain roles, and the participants choose among those available in order to create a dramatization. In addition, they were aware that this working session lasted for one drama lesson, and other occasions would imply new groups and opportunities for other roles (see the previous section).

All the participants rapidly entered into practical work and then into dramatic acting in roles, suggesting that they were engaging in the activity. This is based on the view that the active and lively participation in the creation of the fictive context is related to a willingness to engage in it (Bundy, 2003; Courtney, 1990; Gallagher, 2000).

6.1.3 Strategies for collective creation

The dramatic action and the roles are created in an interrelated process. Simultaneously the meaning of this action is created. In this section, I map which

strategies are used by participants when they create a dramatic action and its meaning together, and the significance of these in terms of learning. As an example, I use the continuation of the same situation as above.

Senja, Adan and Lior have decided to work with a scene from the story where Mutt has put Jeff into a sack, and carries him away. He is mad at Jeff because he feels cheated by him, and intends to throw the sack into the river. It is a long way to the river and when he passes a church, he decides to take a break and go in and listen to a psalm. Mutt places the sack outside the church door. Then an old ox driver comes with a herd of oxen and cows in front of him. The animals run on the sack, so that it tips over. The ox driver opens the sack...

Without being verbally agreed in advance, Adan starts to fetch sleeping mats from the other side of the room, and then Lior and Senja do this too. All three arrange the play space, with chairs and with sleeping mats placed on the floor. Their suggestions about the arrangement are done both verbally and by placing objects. Everyone take an active and lively part in the arrangement. Adan verbally comments how they should be placed in relation to what take place in the dramatic action. Seemingly, he is engaged especially in arranging the sleeping mats on the floor. The others help to adjust the sleeping mats. Both Senja and Adan hold a piece of cloth in their arms.

Adan (*about the placement of sleeping mats*): -Little more that way. Here shall [...] (*points on a chair placed beside the sleeping mats and says the real name of Lior*) sit and listen to a psalm.

Senja (*to Lior*): -And you are Mutt?

Lior (*with emphasis*): -Yes!

Senja: -There! (*All three stretch their back and stop arranging the sleeping mats.*)

Lior (*looks at the sleeping mats on the floor*): -Yes.

Senja lifts up the piece of cloth and says:

- This is my animals.

Adan: -Yes. And this is... (*Adan wraps himself in the piece of cloths.*)

Senja: -But that is a quilt.

Adan: -Yes, but...

Senja. -Yeah, you are Jeff.

Adan: -Yes, I am Jeff. (*He covers himself better.*)

Senja: - But you must do like this. (*Senja shows an action but it cannot be seen which on the video-recording.*)

Lior circulates around the other two and looks at them.

Lior (*referring to the tie that Senjas is wearing*): -Nice tie!

Senja stops, looks at the tie, and says:

-Thank you.

Senja thereafter goes to the other side of the play space:

- I stand here.

Adan has crouched down on the floor completely covered with the piece of cloths.

Lior sit down on a chair.

Senja (*to Lior*): Now you will... But hallo, now you will carry him. (*Senja goes to Adan and lift up a corner of the piece of cloth.*) Just go a little bit, go a little bit and carry him like this. (*Lior raises and does as Senja demonstrates. Senja drops the fabric.*) Then you put him there and go in. (*Simultaneously as Lior holds the fabric, Adan moves a little bit on the floor.*)

Lior sits down on the chair again.

Senja (*illustrates with the hands that she is praying*): -You can show like this.

Senja goes back to the other side, and lifts up the piece of cloth:

-Okay, now I come. *She crosses the floor shaking the fabric in front of her.*)

From then all three of them are acting in role while they continue to construct the dramatic action... (From transcription from video-recording and written notes, 25 March 2014.)

The physical and the fictional space were created through the practical arrangement and verbally communication. In the excerpt above, Lior and Senja assented to Adan's comment by adjusting the sleeping mats as he says. The sleeping mats symbolized the river. It seems that Adan initially took the role function of "scenographer", since he initiated and told them how to arrange the physical space for the dramatic action, and the others followed this. When Adan thereafter covered himself with the piece of cloth, he entered into the dramatic role as Jeff, that is to say that he took the role function of "actor". In both cases, he was intensively interacting with objects (the sleeping mats and the cover). According to my reading of data, the

bodily interaction with objects can be described as an encounter that is sensed and which affects Adan (see Deleuze, 1968/2004). At the same time, the symbolic meaning of the objects is manifested, the sleeping mats as the river and the cover as the sack. His preoccupation with these objects can be understood as him giving the river and the sack importance in the dramatic action.

Senja successively took a combined role as “dramaturge” and “director”, by using questions and suggestions about co-actors’ actions. At the same time, Senja clarified the dramatic action and the signification of objects, by using verbal comments. She verbally presented that the piece of cloth was the herd of animals. Adan had chosen another piece of cloth to use as the sack, and explained this thought to Senja. It seems that she had the idea that it should be used as a quilt, but she now affirmed Adan’s thought by saying (and maybe showing, even if this not can be seen on the video-recording); “But you must do like this”. Later on, Senja demonstrated what Lior could do to symbolize that he was carrying the sack with Jeff. Lior did so, and Adan joined the action by moving a little bit forward. Here, Adan, Senja and Lior were interacting with each other and the object in the construction of the dramatic act to carry the sack with Jeff inside. According to my reading, Senja often verbally create the signification of actions and objects for the dramatic action, and this is done successively in the interaction.

In the sequence above where Adan, Lior and Senja were working together, it seems that Lior initiated social contact. He first circulated around the others, and then turned to Senja and gave an appreciative comment about the tie she had put on as an attribute for the role of ox driver. This comment and Senja’s response to stop, look at the tie and say “Thank you”, seem to take place as a social interaction, not in role or as part of a role function. Just before this initiative, Lior circled around the others, and seemingly, he sought a way to enter into a social relation with the others and to reassert that he was part of the group. Thereafter, he sat down on the chair, and physically illustrated Mutt inside the church listening to a psalm. One reading of Senja’s comment that he first must carry the sack and the illustration of how he could show that he is holding a psalm book is that she helped him get into the dramatic acting.

Thus, simultaneously with the creation of the symbolic meaning of space and the objects (Franks, 2015a), the participants took different role functions (O’Toole,

1992). This can be understood as an agreement about the dramatic action and its meaning being created as both all the three individuals' actions in and outside a role, and verbal communication about the action. In the initial phase of the group work, the participants have verbally decided which part of the story to dramatize and who shall take which role, and this seems to be a starting point for action, while the meaning of this action was created as part of the doing. Participants interacted with space and objects, and with each other in and outside a role. The group work involved three kinds of roles: dramatic roles, social roles and role functions in the working process. When the participants entered into a dramatic role, they took the role function as actors. They shift between the different ways of interactions, and between the actual and the fictive context, and these movements are not negotiated in advance¹²².

That the youths take and switch between different kinds of roles during the drama process can be understood as them using different strategies to participate in the common creation of the dramatic action and its meaning. One reading of the data is that the youths contributed to the collective creation in different ways depending on previous knowledge and capabilities, and that this was communicated through their concrete actions (Dewey, 1916/2007). It can also be related to Guattari's (1992/1995) idea about collective creation as an ongoing process where neither the result nor the subjects' position are locked in predetermined ways. Thus, each subject does not have a pre-given position and there is an openness for different ways to contribute throughout the process. As Genesko (2000, p. 65) formulates it, this "entails that the praxis of one member is the common action of the whole group".

That each one does not necessarily have to take the same kind of role within the same activity all the time makes it possible for the individual to use her capacities in a meaningful way in relation to the actual topic and to experiment with ways to learn (Dewey, 1916/2007). In the excerpt provided above, Adan's involvement with objects and Senja's verbal creation of signification might be understood as such different ways. This is to suggest that a collective creation of dramatic action opens up for a variety of means for the individual to create interior understanding. Simultaneously, it might open up for the individual's exploration of ways to learn.

¹²² This differs from when a whole class together worked with a theatre performance for a longer period of time, because then the role functions were decided in advance and with support of the drama teacher. This took place in Cypresskolan and Tallenskolan.

As Dewey (ibid.) points out, a variety of possibilities to participate promotes equality in education. It implies that the individuals are given equal possibilities to participate in the educational event and to learn, regardless of her preconditions and previous experiences. This relates to Wahlström's (2014) reasoning about what equity in education can be about. According to a neo-liberal logic, equity concerns the right of all pupils to achieve the prescribed knowledge requirements (see also the section 2.3 in this thesis). This implies a delimited signification of what both knowledge and equity are about. Wahlström highlights a wide signification of equity that concerns pupils' equal possibilities to achieve knowledge and expand their capabilities regardless of preconditions. Based on this, it seems that a variation of possible strategies to participate in a collective process through drama can contribute to equity in education.

6.1.4 Ensemble-building

Previously, I argued that creating a dramatic action and social interplay are interdependent processes in that the social climate is a prerequisite for learning in drama. The interconnection of social and artistic processes in group work in drama is described here as ongoing ensemble-building (Neelands, 2009). In this section, I enquire how this can manifest, and what can preclude such processes.

In the data from observations, it appears that the participants' focus lay mainly on the common activity, and simultaneously work interdependence with a common dramatization implies continuous intra-action between group members. The social climate seems to be created as interconnected with the work on a dramatization. An example of this is the earlier highlighted situation from Cypresskolan, when six pupils adapted *Red riding hood and the wolf* as a detective story (see section 5.2.2.3). In this situation, it appears that one pupil, named Nevin, who did not participate during the previous drama lesson, becomes successively integrated as a member of the group and in the common work. In the analysis, I go back to this situation, now foregrounding how Nevin appears as a co-actor, as a relational doing:

The work starts with the arrangement of the stage design. Vida, Nilo and Maram move the three large rectangular boxes. Nevin stands as if he is

going to move one of the boxes, but remains in the same place, and starts to converse with Vida (*with low voices, and it is not possible to hear what they say.*) Maram comes and helps Vida to move the box, and they simultaneously show the planned position of the box for Nevin. They say that this box shall be used as the bed for grandmother. Earlier the group has decided together that Nevin will take this role.

Simultaneously, the two other group members, Ayo and Justin, talk with the drama teacher about which objects they might need in the dramatization. Nevin listens to this conversation, and moves towards them. When Ayo holds up a bottle for him, he says “yes, I need this”. Ayo gives the bottle to Nevin, who in turn put it beside the bed. (*Successively during the practical work to arrange the stage Nevin is introduced to the plan created during the previous lesson, and takes more and more part in decisions about the dramatization. From this point, he takes part in the negotiation about the dramatic action.*) (From transcription and notes from observation, 18 November 2014.)

Nevin becomes involved in the group work through watching the others, the practical doings and decisions. In this excerpt, it appears that he initially takes a cautious and observing approach, while the others actively start to arrange the stage. By placing the boxes Vida, Nilo and Maram show how the stage is planned to be used in the dramatic action. The box that will be used as a bed for Nevin in his role as grandmother is moved simultaneously as Vida and Nevin are conversing. Even if it cannot be heard in the video-recording what they are saying, it seems that Nevin through watching the others, verbal communication and the practical arrangement is introduced into the group’s idea about the plot. When he decides that he needs a specific object in the dramatic acting and puts it in a specific place, it can be understood as more active participation in the creation of the dramatic action and the meaning of this. From then on, he takes part in negotiations about the dramatic action. Nevin enters into the common activity, not *through* the relation but *as* the relational doing. At the same time, the common (the group) is created (Massumi, 2002).

This example supports the argument that drama acting opens up a creative process that allows for varied means of how to participate and require collaboration, and also

contributes to a simultaneous process of the creation of the group climate. Thus, the group climate can be seen as a relational doing, and this is connected with a common focus on the drama action. The argument that the creation of a dramatic action and social interplay are interdependent processes relates to Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988) reasoning that multiple movements are going on simultaneously and to Foucault's (1991) idea that an event can be constituted of multiple processes.

However, if there are diverging desires among participants or if they all not are engaged in the drama activity, this might preclude the creative process. As mentioned in the previous chapter (p. 150), collaboration in drama is perceived as difficult.

Several youths articulated in interviews that work in small groups can be very fun, but that it can be hard if someone in the group does not contribute, or if the participants find it difficult to reach an agreement. However, none of them related the disagreements to certain occasions. Examples of disagreements or conflicts do not appear in the observation data. A reason for this might be that the participants did not want to expose disagreements to me as a visiting researcher.

To exemplify how the youths reasoned about this, I return to the interview with Nour quoted earlier (p. 150) and its continuation:

Nour: -Det roligaste är när man ska arbeta i [liten] grupp och göra en pjäs
[...] Det svåraste är om vi inte kan samarbeta i gruppen. Det är bra
att ha delade grupper, men det svåraste är om man inte kommer
överens när man ska arbeta i grupp. För då blir det bara bråk. Då
måste man försöka reda ut det, och då... till sist blir det ju bättre.
Men det är inte så kul när man tycker olika saker och så kan man
inte komma överens.

*-The most fun is when you are to work in a [small] group and make a
play. [...] The hardest thing is if we cannot cooperate in the group.
It's good to have divided groups, but the hardest thing is if you do not
agree when you are working in a group. Because then there will just
be fighting. Then you have to try to solve it, and then ... at last it will
be better. But it is not so fun where you think differently and cannot
agree.*

Susanne: -Kan det bli så ibland?

-Can this happen sometimes?

Nour: -Ja, typ om någon säger "Jag vill vara en hare" och så säger nån "Men jag sa först att jag ville vara det." Då blir det ju bråk. För om två vill vara samma sak då måste man ju komma på nåt sätt att komma överens. Och man vet ju kanske inte vem som sa först att man ville vara det, och det blir ganska lätt bråk om sånt. Men sen reder man ut det och då blir det ju jättekul att spela.

-Yes, like if someone says "I want to be a hare" and then someone says "But I said first that I wanted to be that." Then there will be a fight. Because if two want to be the same then you must come up with some sort of agreement. And you may not know who first said that s/he wanted to be this, and it will be quite easy to have a fight. But then you work it out and then it will be very fun to act.

Susanne: -Men det är tråkigt medan man håller på och reder ut det?

-But it is boring while you are trying to work it out?

Nour: -Ja, om man börjar bråka om nåt som inte är jätteviktigt... man kanske bara kan försöka... "Ja, men jag behöver inte vara det, jag kan vara något annat" eller nåt sånt. Så att det inte blir så mycket bråk om en liten sak.

-Yes, if you start to fight about something that's not very important ... you might just try ... "Yes, but I do not have to be this, I can be something else" or something like that. So that there is not so much fighting about a small thing.

(Nour, interview I: 24)

Nour argued that instead of asserting your own claim, it is better to drop this for the sake of the group. One reading of this is that there was openness for each other's ideas, and a focus on what benefits the common creation. In line with Gallagher's (2000, p. 73) reasoning, it can be understood as "an accommodation of perspectives". Then the encounter between divergent desires might open up for the creation of new alternatives as to how to go on together.

Another reading of the data is that there are disagreements not expressed and that participants suppress deviating opinions. This might preclude the collective process and turn the group into one where the subjects have predefined, fixed positions (Guattari, 1992/1995).

The collective process might also be closed down if all participants are not committed to the common activity. Nevin said:

Vissa håller och förstör för andra. Det tycker jag inte är särskilt roligt för den gruppen. Drama är roligt om det inte blir nåt tjafs eller så. Till exempel att man fjantar sig och bara skrattar. Om det blir nåt tjafs och nån fjantar sig, då blir det mest att man säger till läraren och så löser man det.

Some are destroying things for others. I don't think that is fun for this group. Drama is fun if there is no fuss or so. For example if someone messes around and just laughs. If there is fuss and someone messes around, then you mostly tell the teacher and then you solve it. (Nevin, interview I: 30)

This statement can be understood as that if someone does not actively participate and “messes around and just laughs”, this affects the whole group. Nevin did not mention why it can be that this occurs, if it is for example that someone is not willing to engage in the actual task or if there exist tensions between participants. However, it indicates that commitment to an activity is not self-evident and that collaboration in a group is not self-propelled (see Sæbø, 2009). Nevin said that when there is problem, they need the teacher's help. It does not appear in the data how the term “solve” was defined in the youths' statements. Nor does it appear how this situation was solved with the support of the teacher. However, it points to the significance of the active engagement and support of the teacher for group works to be a collective learning process (Dewey, 1938/1997; Törnquist, 2006). As I mentioned earlier, this study does not explicitly focus on the individual teachers' ways to teach. Even so, the impact of the drama teacher's competence concerning group processes has to be highlighted here, because this was important in terms of the quality of group work in the actual classes.¹²³

¹²³ That drama is group art implies that drama pedagogy training in Sweden includes education both in the art form and in group processes. See for example <http://www.dramapedagogen.se/lankar/utbildning/> and links to websites for education in drama (downloaded 7 January 2017). This points to the idea that these components are considered as interrelated in a drama process, and thereby together constitute an important competence for drama teachers.

According to my reading of the data, the drama teachers actively supported the pupils' drama work. During work in small groups, the participants often used different rooms. The drama teachers circulated between the rooms/spaces where groups are working, seemed attentive to what took place in the groups, and intervened with support or challenges when required. It seems that the teachers were actively present during the groups' work, and that they continuously shifted between guidance, challenging, listening and affirming, and also intervening as a discussion leader.¹²⁴ This active presence shifted between being physically present and listening, verbally interfering with information or support, and practically supporting and arranging.

In order to exemplify the drama teachers' shifting approaches, an excerpt is provided from the data. The class was creating a theatre performance together, based on a script written by the drama teacher. This script was not completed, but ended up at a crucial turning point in the dramatic action, and the pupils were now involved in the process to make an end.

The teacher instructs the pupils that they will come up with different ideas about what is going on in the plot for a short while, in small groups. Thereafter the teacher organizes the division into small groups, which all place themselves in small circles in the drama room. Immediately a lively conversation starts in most of the groups. But in one group consisting of four pupils the conversation does not really start, and when the teacher comes it appears that no one in the group has clearly understood what they were supposed to do. The teacher clarifies the task, ends up with "now you can start to brainstorm", and then goes away. Now some of the pupils express suggestions, but the conversation does still not really start. The teacher had circulated in all the groups, and had been listening and observing what is going on in the groups, but now comes back to the specific group and sits down for a longer while. The teacher turns to each pupil with questions. All of them tell ideas about what is going on in the plot and what this might imply. The teacher asks follow-up questions, and emphasizes everyone's ideas by repeating things that might be understood as central, and by a brief summarizing. Questions and summarizing concern

¹²⁴ These are some of the strategies which appear also in Törnquist's (2006) study about the teachers' roles in a collective creation of a musical performance.

the dramatic action, and lead to thicker narratives. The group members are listening to everyone else. (From transcription from video-recording, 27 January 2015.)

In this excerpt, the drama teacher started as an instructor for the task and an organizer of the group composition. The focus for the task was the dramaturgical composition of a dramatic action. When the groups started the conversation, the teacher turned to being listening and attentive to what was going on in the groups. The teacher supported the specific group in the situation mentioned above by clarifying the task, and by an encouragement to start brainstorming, and then leaving. This can be understood as the teacher communicating that the group members had the capacity to do this. However, according to the analysis, more active intervention from the teacher was required, and she sat down in the group and actively led the conversation. The teacher addressed each one in the group with questions related to the dramatic plot, and opened up for the pupils' sharing of different ideas. It turned out that all of the pupils in the group had ideas about the dramatic action, and thereby contributed with different alternatives for how this might proceed. One reading of this is that the teacher was steering the pupils towards a common focus with questions and repeating of things that was considered central. The drama teacher's active attention to what took place in the groups, and the adaptation of an approach as leader, was ongoing during the whole group work process.

The examples discussed in this section indicate that the participants' active engagement in the common creation of a dramatic action and its meaning, and social interplay are mutually interrelated. It is clear that ensemble processes are ongoing and hard work, and that support from the teacher is crucial.

In drama, action takes place simultaneously in a fictive and social context. Based on Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988) reasoning that experiences are the milieu where learning take place, I argue that in drama the fictive and social together form the milieu.

Social interaction is thereby both a prerequisite for learning in drama and something the subject learns about through participation. A characteristic for drama is that learning about social interplay takes place at the same time as the collaboration together creating a dramatic action and through interacting in roles in a

fictive context. Thereby, learning comprises both the dramatic action and the social interplay here-and-now. Said with other words, *what* is learned and *how* this is done are interconnected (Deleuze, 1968/2004; Dewey, 1934/2005). Thus, the process is not subordinated on predefined outcomes (Ball & Olmedo, 2013) which is often the case within the current school education in Sweden. Then the educational process becomes a one-way transport route to arrive at this, and the individual is supposed to perform in accordance with a prescribed direction.

6.1.5 The actor and the role

This next section deals with the analysis of what ways participants express and relate to their dramatic role and, in turn, how this might contribute to learning. As examples are used some excerpts from another lesson when pupils worked with the story *Mutt and Jeff*.

In this part of the story, the Sexton is visiting the Peasants' wife. When the Peasant comes home, the wife helps the Sexton to hide himself in a coffin, because she knows that the husband hates Sextons. Jeff has seen this from outside the house. He has been invited now by the Peasant into the house, Jeff brings with him a sack with an animal skin. He pretends that there is a wizard in the sack.

Kim has the role as animal skin/wizard's voice. The sack is illustrated with sleeping mats on the floor, Kim is sitting on one and is covered with another.

Robin in the role as Jeff tells Adel in the role as the Peasant: - He is in the coffin. He says that he is in the coffin. (*Robin makes a gesture with his arms.*) He is so horrible. He looks like a Sexton.

Adel/Peasant (*with an exaggerated voice, lifting her arms deprecatingly*): - Oh, no! I hate Sextons.

Adel/Peasant rises and goes to the "coffin" (illustrated by chairs on which Billie/in the role as the Sexton is laying covered with a sleeping mat.) Lou and Robin turn their bodies towards the "coffin", and follow Adel with their eyes.

Robin/Jeff (*with a formal voice*): -God so exiting when he opens this coffin.

Adel/Peasant bends down and lifts up the sleeping mat that covers Billie. Immediately rises again, lifts up her arms over her head and runs back to the chair, screaming:

- AAAHHH!

Lou and Robin follow Adel with their eyes and laugh. (From transcription and written notes from an observation, 26 November 2013.)

In the beginning of this sequence, Robin and Adel presented aspects of the roles as an exterior expression with voices and with their bodies while they were talking or doing a specific activity in a role. When one of them was saying/doing something, the other is sitting in a “neutral” position on the chair, and it is not how this person relates to the role. Billie illustrated the hidden Sexton by lying covered with a sleeping mat, and thereby presented the role as a physical position. In the sequence, Lou was watching what the others were doing within the fictive frame, but from the data, it is hard to discern if it is in role or not.

Adel, in the role as Peasant, went to the coffin and discovered the Sexton. Adel expressed the Peasant’s reaction with lively gestures, voice and movements, and this can be understood as that she was engaging with the dramatic action “from *inside* it” (Bolton, 1992, p. 4). Both Lou and Robin left their roles, and laughed. It seems that Adel’s expression was perceived so fun and interesting that Lou and Robin were so concentrated on this action that they lost focus on their own roles.

When Adel sat down again, Lou imitated the movement and screaming. Still sitting on the chair, Lou lifted her arms and make sound of screaming with a low voice:

- Aaahhh!

The lifted arms can be seen as a symbolic expression of fear, and this can be described as representing action (see Rasmussen, 2008). Lou imitated Adele’s action, but did this with smaller expressions, sitting on the chair, and used a low voice. No other participant in the group noticed this, and seemingly it was about an experiment with the sensation to perform this bodily action, but as a real action and not as a presentation in role.

Later in the same situation, Jeff has sold the sack to the peasant, for a whole bushel of money.

Adel/Peasant (*to Robin/Jeff*): -I give you a bushel of money.

Robin/Jeff: Okey. (*Rises*)

Kim (*lifts away a flap of the sleeping mat, looks up towards Adel and Robin, and says with an exaggerated voice and a big smile*): -But it must be HEAPED. A HEAPED BUSHEL OF MONEY.

Robin/Jeff sits down on the chair again.

Kim: -A HEAPED bushel.

Robin/Jeff: -It shall be heaped.

Adel/Peasant: -Absolutely. (From transcription from video-recording, 26 November 2013.)

Kim, in the physically motionless role as the skin/wizard's voice, used verbal expression to take a more active part in the dramatic acting.

In the examples above, Billie and Kim had roles that were physically motionless, and with little verbal communication, but both roles have significance for the dramatized plot. One reading of data is that the objects both defined where the sack and the coffin were placed, and supported Kim and Billie to maintain their roles during the working process.

Robin (*to Adel, while doing a gesture with his arms*): -Don't forget to ask about the coffin.

Adel: -Yeah, right. (*Turns her body sideways back and forth several times, and says as the Peasant*): -But you must bring with you the coffin. I don't want to have it. (From transcription and written notes from an observation, 26 November 2013.)

Here Robin and Adel were not in role, negotiating what the role character Peasant would say. Adel then did a movement with her body, and entered into the role. This movement seems to be a bodily doing that supports the re-entering into the fictive role.

Later on, in the same situation, a chair was used as a wheelbarrow. Decisions about what objects symbolize and how to use them was negotiated by the participants during the working process.

Robin, goes to a chair, put his hand on the backrest, and says in role:

- Can I take this wheelbarrow?

The co-actor, Adel, embraces this idea by moving the body towards Robin and says in role:

- Of course, take the wheelbarrow.

Robin puts the chair forward. Lou makes a gesture towards Robin and says, out of role:

- That will be a great wheelbarrow. (From transcription from video-recording, 26 November 2013.)

Here, Robin and Adel negotiated in roles and through actions that the chair should symbolize a wheelbarrow. Lou, not in role, consolidated that from now on this is a wheelbarrow during their dramatization. The use of a physical object as the wheelbarrow and the verbal confirmation can be understood as that it is given a key significance in the story as dramatized by the group.

According to my analysis of the data, it appears that during work in small groups, there was constant movement between the actual social context and the fictive context. This implies that there was switching between conversation together as peers about the actions in the fictive context, and acting within the fictive context.

When participants talked about the fictive context, it was often about the concrete planning of actions. When acting in the fictive context, some aspects of the role characters were portrayed in an aesthetic way. Presentation of a role for example included gestures and movements, voice, expression of attitude and emotion, and according to my analysis, though all these aspects were not often used simultaneously. In the excerpt above, it seems that Adel has fully submitted to the action, when she discovered the Sexton in her role as the Peasant, and runs away screaming. As Bolton (1992) points out, this is not about pretending to be a role character as “realistically” as possible in all different aspects, but to be fully engaged in the actions “here and now”. Sometimes the participants presented the role as an

exterior doing. This might be the case when Billie in his role as the Sexton was hidden under a sleeping mat. Sometimes, they illustrated the actions physically within the fictive frame but without being in role, as Lou and Robin when they were watching Adel as the Peasant open the coffin. In some cases, they came out of role and negotiated the next dramatic actions together. The relation between the acting subject and the role differed, but was never a mere copy of an action in ordinary life (see Bolton, 1992; Rasmussen, 2008).

It seems that objects contributed to the commitment to the fictive context and actions in role, in that they contribute to a common focus, creation of a physical expressions, reinforce the fictive context and help to “build belief” (Bolton, 1992; O’Toole, 1992). The bodily intra-action with space and objects involves the sense of touch, and so can the visual and auditory senses. Since the intra-action is an encounter between action, affect and perception, it can be described as *haptic* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988).

The different ways of relating to one’s own role and the others’ roles, and the continuous moves between different positions within the fictive frame, can be understood as a dynamic move between the actual and the fictive. According to my reading of observation data, the meaning of the acting in the fictive context was created as an ongoing process by participants both when they are acting in role and out of role. As Courtney (1990) points out, meaning can be produced in the creation together of a dramatization. Thus, the dramatic space between actual and fictive can be described as an in-between space of external and internal actions.

To act in role is a sensory, affective and cognitive action, enacted simultaneously in a physical, social and a fictive context. In the interviews, many participants mention aspects of this when they talk about experiences and perceptions about acting in role. An example is Vanja’s statement, and this is chosen here because it includes different aspects of what acting in role can be about:

Man går in i en roll och sen så låter man bara fantasin flöda... Den bara får ta plats... som den inte brukar få så ofta annars, i vanliga alldagslivet, tycker jag... Jag tänker även när man kanske pratar om det, om man till exempel ska... Vi säger att vi ska anordna en scen, och även då kan man

komma på grejer, och... ja, drama är väl inte bara att vara "in act" utan också... Ja, men det är tillståndet som hjärnan är i, tycker jag, att det är ganska fritt. Man känner sig friare... man kan spåna på idéer och tankar, och även spela. [...] Det här med att gå in i roll, det är ganska viktigt i drama, tycker jag, att... man verkligen... "Nu är jag den vaktmästaren." Och då är jag honom.

You enter a role and then you just let your imagination flow... It just has to take place... as it usually doesn't do, in ordinary everyday life, I think... I think that also when you maybe talk about it, if you for example shall... We say that we are going to arrange a scene, and even then you can come up with things, and... well, drama is not only to be "in act" but also... Yes, it is the brain's condition, I think, that is it rather free. You feel more free... you can brainstorm on ideas and thoughts, and also act. [...] This idea about entering a role, this is rather important in drama, I think, that... you really... "Now I am the janitor." Then I am him. (Vanja, interview I: 20)

In this quotation, external actions were mentioned, in that the participant plays a role, and comes with ideas about a scene. This suggests that acting was perceived to involve physical, verbal and social doings. The affective component appears when Vanja said that she could feel more free in drama. The utterances about letting the imagination take place, and that "it is the brain's condition", can be understood as an interior, mental action. According to my reading, this can be seen as a co-existence of virtual image and actual affection and perception (Deleuze, 1977/2002). In dramatic acting in role, the creation of the fiction is simultaneously an interior, mental action, and an exterior physical expression. Thereby, dramatic acting is about making the virtual actual.

Later in the interview, Vanja makes a connection between acting in role in drama and learning, suggesting that drama opens up for exploration of potential becomings. Virtualities can actualize through a process of differentiation (Deleuze, 1968/2004). The actualization is not a realization of the virtual, but a difference in itself. Vanja says:

Av drama tror jag att man lär sig... jag tror man lär känna sig själv bättre. Jag tror det för att man... hm... man får ju experimentera delar och sidor utav en som man kanske inte... Ja, men inte i vanliga fall tänker på att man

faktiskt har. Innan [...] var jag ganska tyst... öh (*skrattar till*)... Då var jag ganska tyst, och tog allting ”Javisst. Sure. Fine, det är klart att du kan göra så, det spelar ingen roll.” Nu är jag inte så tyst längre... men... och jag accepterar inte allting heller... för att jag har lärt mig att om... åh, vad jobbigt det är, det är så många delar. Det är svårt kanske att förstå kopplingen mellan det här med acceptans och drama men... man får bättre självförtroende, tycker jag... man får bättre självförtroende och självkänsla. *From drama, I think that you learn... I think that you get to know yourself better. I believe that because you ... hm... you can experiment with parts and sides of yourself that you normally maybe not... think that you in fact has. Before [...] I was rather quiet... oh (laughs)... I was rather quiet, and took everything “Of course. Sure. Fine, of course you can do so, it doesn’t matter.” Now I am not so quiet anymore... but... and I don’t accept everything... because I have learnt that if... åh, how difficult this is, there are so many parts. It is maybe difficult to understand the connection between this acceptance and drama but... you get better self-confidence, I think... you get better self-confidence and self-esteem.* (Vanja, interview I: 20)

In the quotations from this interview, different aspects of acting in a role are highlighted. Acting in a role can imply the use of the imagination, to be free and to learn new sides of oneself, but also to “be” a character. The expression to “be” a character is used in interviews. Here, different ways appear about how to connect the subject and the fictive role. To explore new sides of oneself is about temporarily actualizing potential becomings in dramatic action. In another interview, work with a role is seen to be about empathizing with the role, and exploring different ways of being:

Om man får en roll, om man ska vara en helt annan person, så måste man jobba på att vara den rollen, leva sig in. Man kan lära sig att vara en annan person, en annan version av sig själv. *If you get a role, if you will be a completely different person, you must work on being this role, to empathize. You can learn to be another person, another version of yourself.* (Alde, interview II: 7)

The encounter between the subject and the role in this sense can be an experience of new ways to act and become. To be “another version of yourself” can be understood as an actualization of another way of acting and being than the individual hitherto has had. Olsson (2008, p. 206) makes a connection with children’s play, when she argues that this can be seen as “a plunging into the most intense actualization of virtuality. This also concerns drama, in that it can provide a space for exploration of potential becomings. Dramatic acting drama can be about trying possible beings and alternatives of ways to act in the world.

Even though this may apply to other areas, such as for example when reading a novel or daydreaming, a characteristic for drama is that the participant is trying different ways to act and be simultaneously in the physical and social context, and the fictive context through action and role taking. The acting is a sensory, affective and cognitive experiencing in the actual world. Because it simultaneously is done in the dramatic context, the participant can experiment ways to act that she has not done in ordinary life. Thereby, dramatic acting can open for a new understanding of possible ways to act and be.

6.1.6 Taking other(s) point of view

Perspective-taking concerns both seeing things from others’ point of view, and considering something from different perspectives. It can for example be about imagining how one’s choice can affect others (Braidotti, 2006, 2010), or to mentally inquire about different alternatives and perspectives before the actual realization of an act or taking a decision (Dewey, 1938/1991). To take another’s perspective is a complex process that is both interior and exterior. As mentioned earlier the mechanism to imagine that we are acting in role in a fictive context seems to also be active when we take the perspective of others.

Empathizing with the role was mentioned as a significant part of learning in drama by several participants in interviews. One example is from Sonny, provided in the previous chapter (p. 146), that acting in role can contribute to the ability to empathize with others and see different ways to handle situations. Another, Nicola, told in detail what it could be like to take a role character’s perspective:

Susanne: - Tror du att du har lärt dig något i drama som du inte skulle kunna ha lärt dig på nåt annat sätt?

- *Do you think that you have learned something in drama that you could not have learned in some other way?*

Nicola: - ...Jag tror inte att jag skulle ha lärt mig att... Jag tror inte att jag skulle ha varit lika kreativ om inte haft drama... För på dramat får man olika syn på olika saker. Man tänker "En sån här person skulle tänka så här". För man tänker in i rollens person, man tänker... Om man till exempel spelar en sur gubbe, kanske man förstår hur han tänker, och då kan man... Det kanske man inte förstår på andra ämnen. Till exempel om man läser en text på svenskan, då står det så här "sur gubbe", säger vi nu... äum... men man förstår inte riktigt varför han tänker så. För man vet att han är så, men man förstår inte varför. Men om man gör drama så kan man liksom förstå... Man kan liksom se ur hans synvinkel. Man lär sig se...

- *...I think that I would not have learned to... I think that I would not have been so creative if I did not have drama... Because in drama you get different views on different things. You think "Such a person should think like this". Because you think into the role's person, you think... If you for example play an annoyed old man, you might understand how he thinks, and then you can... You might not understand this through other school subjects. If you for example read a text in Swedish, it can read "annoyed old man"... aum... but you don't really understand why he thinks like that. Because you know that he is like that, but you don't understand why. But if you do drama you might like understand... You might see from his perspective. You learn to see...*

Susanne: - Hur kan man göra det?

- *How can you do this?*

Nicola: - Jag tror att om man spelar som den personen kan man liksom... man liksom förstår den bara. Man kan liksom bara se ur dens synpunkt. Man tänker... försöker alltid att bli så mycket in i den rollen som man kan. Så till slut börjar man tänka som den under pjäsen. Man tänker så här: "Nu är jag, jag spelar inte bara en sur gubbe, jag ÄR en sur gubbe." Och då så förstår man... om man

tänker som en sur gubbe, då förstår man lite hur sura gubbar tänker.

- *I think that if you play as this person you might like... you might Just understand him. You just can see from his point of view. You think... always try to be as much in this role as possible. Finally you begin to think as him during the play. You think like this: "Now I am, I do not only act as an annoyed old man, I AM an annoyed old man." And then you understand... If you think as an annoyed old man, then you can understand a little bit how annoyed old men think.*

Susanne: - Du har ju aldrig varit en sur, gammal gubbe, vad är det som gör att du ändå kan förstå nånting av vad det innebär att vara en sur gubbe?

- *You have never been an annoyed old man, what makes it possible for you to still understand something of what it is to be an annoyed old man?*

Nicola: - Jag tror att om man väl sätter sig in i rollen, som en sur gubbe nu då, då kan man liksom... Jag vet ju nånstans hur omvärlden ser på den här sura gubben, men den sura gubben kanske inte förstår att han är en sur gubbe. Han kanske tänker att "Jag är en normal gubbe". Att andra är överaktiva gubbar. Det är ju en... det är lite svårt att förklara. Jag tror man bara förstår det bättre.

- *I think that if you have put yourself in the role, as annoyed old man now, then you can like... I somewhere know how the world looks at this annoyed old man, but the annoyed man maybe not understand that he is an annoyed old man. Maybe he thinks that "I am a normal old man." That others are overactive old men. It is a... it's a bit difficult to explain. I think that you just understand it better.*

(Nicola, interview I: 31)

Nicola described how dramatic acting might contribute to putting oneself in the perspective of someone else. In this example, it was about a created role character, an "annoyed old man", and simultaneously this role is a representation of what it might be about to be an annoyed old man. The role actualizes how it potentially might be in ordinary life. Thus, it is simultaneously acting in a fictive role and an exploration of a potential being (Baldwin, 2012; Rasmussen, 2008). It is seen as an exterior act

because it is corporeal and spatial. It is also exterior in the sense that the subject comes into presence in the world as an exterior relation (Deleuze, 1995/2001). Simultaneously, it is interior since we experience the world as sensory perception, affects and thoughts. As Deleuze's (1988a) argues, the "experimental world is folded, the fold being "the inside *of* the outside" (Deleuze, 1988, p. 96, quoted in Semetsky, 2010, p. 478). This implies that the act of taking another's perspective is both exterior and interior.

In the act of taking another's perspective, as a first step, one displaces oneself mentally to the location of the observed person, and as a second step, one simulates the observed action in order to understand it. The act to imagine oneself in another's position can be understood as both a corporeal and mental process. In the process of perspective-taking, we use our own experiences, emotions and intensions, in that we "self-attribute" (Berthoz, 2003/2006; Thirioux, Jorland, Bret, Tramus, & Berthoz, 2009, p. 196) the other's actions, and is simultaneously conscious about our own position. The mirror system is active, together with a spatial awareness and the subject's earlier experiences of what a specific emotion can be about (Baldwin, 2012). Based on this. I understand the process of taking another's perspective as an entangled sensory, mental and affective action. In this process, earlier experiences and the imagination of potential beings are interconnected.

In addition to the subject taking the perspective of someone else, Nicola also pointed to another perspective, how others might perceive this role character, as a role and as a representation of a person. Nicola said that others in the environment might perceive the old man in one way, while the old man perceives himself in another way. Not only the actor's perspective as a person and the perspective of the role character, but also others' perspectives of the role character appear here. This indicates that dramatic acting "as if" involves exploration of different points of views, and that the actor moves between these viewpoints during the action. Thus, dramatic acting in a role involves taking different perspectives in the process of acting in the role. The distinctive nature of learning processes in drama is that different perspectives are explored through experiencing and expressing in dramatic acting and as intra-action with other participants.

6.1.7 The participant as spectator

The doing “acting in role” includes both to act oneself and to watch peers who are acting. According to the interviews, both parts are perceived as being fun and contribute to learning.

Det bästa med drama, det är att få spela, ATT få spela och att titta på drama
[...] Det är lite roligare att få spela, men det är nästan lika bra att få titta.

The best with drama, it is to act, TO act, and to watch drama [...] It is a bit more fun to act, but it is almost as good to watch. (Mio, interview I: 19)

The participating classes were recurrently working with dramatizations in small groups, which they thereafter present for the whole group, and the work with *Mutt and Jeff* is an example of this. It seems that the process to create dramatizations based on a given story and to perform these for their peers might contribute to an understanding of different ways to interpret what this story is about. Referring to the drama work with the story *Mutt and Jeff*, Jean says:

När man lyssnar på med en historia och sen gör en pjäs av den, då kan man förstå den bättre. Man kan förstå den på olika sätt, om flera gör samma... Och då lär man sig kanske att tänka på olika sätt, när man ser en film eller läser en bok eller så.

When you listen to a story and then make a play of it, then you can understand it better. You can understand it in different ways, if several do the same... And then you maybe learn to think in different ways, when you see a film or read a book or so. (Jean, interview II: 5)

To be a spectator when peers are acting seems to be connected with intense engagement. According to what appears in the data, watching was a communicative activity involving the whole body. The direction of bodies and gazes, together with gestures, movements and laughing, can together be understood as focused attention on the acting in role of peers. This is exemplified in the following sequence:

Six pupils are sitting next to each other, on chairs. They are watching a small group of peers that are acting in an improvisation. Most of the time, their bodies are directed towards peers who are acting. Some of them are

leaning forward while continuing to watch. On three occasions, some of them are laughing, while they are watching their peers. Simultaneously as they are laughing, they are moving their bodies; moving onwards on the chair, clapping with their hands on their knees or stretching their back. During the whole sequence, gazes are directed towards their peers. (From transcription of video-recording, 4 March 2014.)

In my notes, I wrote that the spectators seem to have an intensive focus on what took place in the improvisation (field notes, 4th March 2014). In this sequence, the audience were watching, but were not taking part as actors in the dramatization. According to my reading of the data, the spectators were participating actively and engaging in what takes place. (See Bolton, 1984.)

Vision can be understood as a complex and creating activity. Visual perception is interrelated with different senses (Massumi, 2002), and with emotions and imagination (Bundy, Ewing & Fleming, 2013; Courtney, 1990; Berthoz, 2003/2006). Emotional engagement in something opens up the possibilities of focused attention, and can activate associations with other experiences. To watch is not only to be a receiver, it is a process of the construction of who/what we are watching, and in this process we are relating to ourselves and our experiences: we are seeing both the other and our self (Berthoz, 2003/2006). Thus, it seems that it can also work in the other direction, in that personal experiences lead to more focused attention as a spectator:

Man har kanske lärt sig [...] vara en bättre lyssnare som publik. När man själv stått här uppe inför publik och visat nånting inför gruppen. Så när det är nån annans tur då kanske man lär sig att det är ganska jobbigt att stå där.
You might have learned [...] to be a better listener as audience. When you have been standing here in front of an audience and performed something for the group. So when it is someone else's turn then you might learn that it can be pretty tough to stand there. (Juno, interview I: 13)

The situations being considered here are about watching peers who are acting in role. The audience's focus for attention might be both on the actual actions and on the roles acting in a fictive context, simultaneously. A basis for this thought is that perception is seen as a double activity, in that one perceives with the senses, and

simultaneously combines the actual experience with memories of other experiences, and imaginations about possibilities. The imagination is here understood as “[...] the capacity to discern similarities and differences between diverse experiences, traces and sensations [...] to draw connections and establish links” (Braidotti, 2006, pp. 163-164).) In a dramatization, one is conscious that one is in the actual context and in an imagined context, and as mentioned earlier, this can be described as a double consciousness. A spectator of a dramatization simultaneously sees the acting person and the fictive character in action, and as mentioned above, in the activity of watching others acting, the individual may also make connections with her own experiences. To be a spectator can be understood as a sensory and cognitive experiencing that activate affections and connections to earlier experiences. Through the process of watching, the spectator might create new understanding both about herself and about the actual dramatic action (Bundy, Ewing & Fleming, 2013; Fischer-Lichte, 2004/2008). Thereby, the experiencing as spectator contributes to learning in drama education.

This implies that being an actor and a spectator are included parts of a drama event. It can be understood as an in-between space that opens up for intra-actions in both the actual and the fictive context. The actors’ performing affects the spectator, and the spectator engagement and responses affect the actors, both in the actual context and in the fictive. An example of how the response from the spectators affects the person who acts was given by Torild:

Första gången jag stod på scenen var jag väldigt nervös och tänkte på vad jag skulle göra. För jag hade erfarenheter från min förra skola att gör jag fel så skrattar alla. Men det var ingen som sa nåt, och det kändes så bra.

The first time on the stage I was very nervous and thought about what to do. Because I had experiences from my previous school that if I do something wrong everyone will laugh. But nobody said anything and it felt so good.

(Torild, interview 1: 20)

Torild expressed the view that the response from the spectators was related to them being peers and that the climate in the class is good. A significant factor for engagement among participants seems to be that drama is about an experience together among peers. This concerns both when they act in front of the others, and

they are spectators. It can be related to Juno's statement provided above that the experiences of acting oneself can contribute to the focused attention as a spectator. Another of the youths, Raja, pointed out that it is a process working in both directions:

Vi [i klassen] får göra mycket saker tillsammans. Vi kommer närmare varandra när det är bara vi i ett rum... Jag lär mig genom att titta på andra, hur de gör. Och jag har lärt mig kroppsspråk, och tänker på hur de andra och hur publiken svarar.

[...]

Jag har lärt mig att lita på. De andra kan lita på mig. Och jag har lärt mig att lita mer på mig själv... och att lita lite mer på folk. Inte först lita på, men lära sig lita på som en process liksom.

We [in the class] do many things together. We come closer to each other when it's just us in a room... I learn through watching others, how they do. And I have learned body language, and think about how the others and how the audience respond.

[...]

I have learned to trust. The others can trust me. And I have learned to rely more on myself... and to trust people a little more. Not trust first, but to learn to trust like as a process. (Raja, interview 1: 38)

The examples used so far are about drama events where the participants in small groups created a dramatization which was then presented to the whole group. Through the analysis, qualities appear that are specific for learning in and through drama.

The work in small groups promotes learning because this provides a space where the youths dare to try new expressions. The dramatic acting in a role in a fictive context provides a space for an exploration about both the dramatic action and the meaning of this, and who the subject can be and become. The possibilities to take a fictive role and that this is formed successively by the participant, open up for exploration of others' perspectives and to empathize with others. Simultaneously, it gives the freedom for tentative experimentation of new ways to act and think. The perceived freedom is made possible because the emphasis lies on creating and process, and not on a predefined outcome. To act in a role is a sensory, affective and

cognitive process, and this contribute to participants' commitment. That the creating of dramatic role and action takes place as an ongoing process indicates that it contains improvisation. (The component improvisation will be discussed in the subsequent chapter 7.)

The common work contributes to learning to collaborate, and to create a dramatization to perform for others contributes to learning about communication. The possibilities to use different role functions during the working process implies the possibility for the individual to participate in a way useful for her to engage in and contribute to the common creation. Thus, a drama activity allows for individual differences, and nevertheless all are equal contributors of the common. This opens up for a simultaneous collective and individual learning process.

The following section deals with work with Forum play which involves the creation of small plays followed by an exploration together in the whole group of different ways of handling problems presented in the plays. I use this example for a continuing enquiry of what is distinctive for drama education within compulsory schooling in Sweden.

6.2 Forum play

The pupils in one class were introduced to Forum play as a dramatic form. (Forum play, its basis in Forum Theatre formed by Boal, and how it is practiced within Swedish school education, have been highlighted in section 2.2.5 in this thesis.) The idea of Forum play is “to enhance commitment by creating distance to that which is usually taken for granted, and in doing so opening for new perspectives and new ways to think and act” (Österlind, 2011, p. 250). In the actual lesson, the drama teacher introduced Forum play as a dramatic form, and it was connected to the theme of “friendship”. The object for learning was both about the dramatic form and about the theme.

The lesson started with the exercises *Sculptures* and the Value Clarification *Four corners*¹²⁵, which both dealt with the theme of what friendship can be about and what

¹²⁵ The exercise *Sculpture* can be used in various ways in drama education, and in this occasion the pupils were divided into groups of four or five and the task was to create a sculpture on the theme of “friendship”, and in which all in the group were parts of the sculpture.

the worst thing can be to be subjected to among friends. It concerned how the pupils personally perceived this. Thereafter the drama teacher presented Forum play, and gave information about the background to and purpose of this working form. The pupils were given the task in smaller groups to construct short dramatic plays that illustrated what it can be like when someone is exposed to betrayal, exclusion or exploitation by peers. These plays were performed in front of all the others, and different ways of handling the problem were tried out.

In this work, the emphasis lay on the thematic content. This is reflected in some of the interviews, and one example is Camille's and Misha's views:

Camille: -Man lärde sig att stoppa mobbing. Det var ju det man gjorde till slut. Man gjorde så att det inte skulle bli så mer. Man lärde sig... utanför drama lektionen, på fritiden, att man kan stoppa mobbing såhär. Att det behövs så lite, alltså att man kan göra nån skillnad. För det såg man ju verkligen här. Om man gjorde något annat så blev det skillnad.

-You learned to stop bullying. That was what you did in the end. You made it be no more. You learned... outside the drama lesson, on leisure time, that you can stop bullying like this. That so little is required, that is to say that you can make a difference. Because you really saw this here. If you did something else there was a difference.

Misha: -Man kan lära sig att det man gör får konsekvenser.

-You can learn that what you do has consequences.

Camille: -Stoppa mobbing.

-Stop bullying.

Misha: -Om du ser det så kan man försöka stoppa det.

-If you see it then you can try to stop it.

(Camille and Misha, interview II: 2)

Camille and Misha refer to when the whole group together worked with a forum play scene, and were trying out different ways to handle a situation where bullying occurs.

In the exercise *Four corners* participants can choose between four given statements representing different opinions concerning an actual theme: they physically position themselves in the corner of the room that relates to the statement they agree with, and thereafter they verbally reflect together.

They made connections between the dramatic action and ordinary life. In the exploration together of possible ways to handle the problematic situation, imagination and earlier experiences are used and combined in new ways. The pupils are co-constructing potential ways to act in the dramatic situation. Misha's statement "If you see it then you can try to stop it" can be understood as that this experience in drama might, in turn, contribute to expanded preparedness to act in ordinary life.

Thus, the drama event is not separated from other parts of the participants' lives. Earlier experiences and knowledge are used as means for creating new knowledge (Dewey, 1916/2007, 1933). This has resonance with Deleuze's (1995, 2001) reasoning about immanence, that thinking and acting are working at the same immanent plane. Memories of other experiences, imagination and what actually takes place here-and-now all contribute to the construction of knowledge. The pupils are actively participating in this construction. They do not simply become someone who performs well and delivers results based on standardized requirements, in accordance with a neoliberal logic (Ball, et al., 2012) which is the current direction of Swedish school education.

6.2.1 Significance of aesthetic distancing

That the content of a dramatic action has connection with the participants' ordinary life is not the same as the idea that the fiction and the actual is merged. An exploration through dramatic acting can contribute to a reflection about issues just because of the aesthetic form. In the previous section 6.1.2, the importance of the agreement to be involved in dramatic action "as if" was discussed. It is also significant that the drama context provides an *aesthetic distancing* (Eriksson, 2009) through which the participants have possibilities to make connections between the fictive context and other experiences in their lives. Aesthetic distancing is about using the aesthetic form in order "to make something ordinary appear strange" (ibid., p. 24). The dramatic context can provide a space where the participants can explore a phenomenon and simultaneously perceive integrity. If they do not perceive integrity in relation to the dramatic action, there might be resistance to get involved (Bolton, 1984; Bundy, 2003).

The significance of aesthetic distancing becomes visible when reflected on a situation where this initially seemed not to be the case. This appears in one single

situation in the data, when participants in a small group created a scene in a forum play:

The teacher has given the instruction that each group should construct a short dramatic play that illustrated what it can be like when someone is exposed to betrayal, exclusion or exploitation by peers. It should be about something that possibly could take place in ordinary life.

This group verbally discuss what the scene should be about, and who should perform which action. This lasts for a long while. They remain standing still together during this discussion. Most of the time is spent in negotiating the roles in the play. One of the role characters will exploit one of the others. Finally, one of the participants says: "Okay, I can be this person." The participants then discuss what will be concretely done in the scene. On the whiteboard, one of them writes the name of an existing supermarket near the actual school. They construct a scene with a fictive action, but which illustrates an ordinary life situation. It is situated in a well-known place. When the youths start to act, they illustrate the actions without taking defined roles. They all participate in the dramatic action, using small gestures and ordinary voices. They perform the actions but do not put much energy in them. They use their real names during the work with the scene.

Then the drama teacher comes to the group and tells the pupils to give the role characters fictive names. The teacher also says that there remains a short time for working, and then leaves. The youths give the roles fictive names that are used during the following processing of the scene. From then on, all the participating youths actively take part in the creation of the scene through acting in role and expressing the role characters' attitude with more lively gestures and voices. (From transcription, field notes and emplaced memories from observation, 5 November 2013.)

This drama lesson described here involved activities with many connections to everyday life. The task to create a forum play was based on a specific theme, and a premise was that the situation could happen in ordinary life. In this small group, the participating youths talked verbally about the play for a long time before they started to try it out in action. The conversation was about the planning of what they should do and who should do what, and they did not talk about how actual actions might be experienced by the role characters involved. The youths remained standing still for a long while and when they started to act small gestures and ordinary voices were

used. They did not put much energy into the expressions, but rather fulfilled the task. My reading of the data is that this way of working with drama was something new for the youths, and they therefore did not know how to handle the task. The instruction was that the play should be about something that possibly could take place in ordinary life. An unwillingness to take the role as someone who exploits someone else and the situating of the dramatic action near an existing supermarket near the actual school can be read as a misconception that the play should be about something that had happened in the youths' own ordinary life. This might have precluded engagement because they did not perceive integrity. Thus, the familiarity with the actual drama form might have an impact on how a task is understood and the engagement in the doing (Bundy, 2003; Nicholson, 2002). When the teacher had given the information about giving the role characters fictive names, and the participants did so, it appears that the engagement in the action increased. This appeared through their more lively bodily and voice expressions when acting in role. This indicates that the use of fictive names supported the creation of the fiction, and thereby an aesthetic distancing.

In drama, the fictive frame opens for a corporeal exploration of different perspectives and ways to act, because the participants are aware that it is fiction. So even though the use of aesthetic distancing applies to different art forms, as for example literature and film, a characteristic for drama is the acting "as if" and that it comprises a reflection both in action and about action. The interconnections of experiencing and expressing in dramatic acting and the reflection produce learning processes distinct for drama, and as Ericsson (2009) points out, aesthetic distancing is a significant component in these processes.

6.2.1 Corporeal and verbal reflection together

In Forum play, the exploration of alternative ways to handle a problem takes place as work in the whole group. Together the participants try out various alternatives through dramatic acting and reflect on these verbally together. To allow multiple thoughts to be explored through action requires ample time, and this is important because learning takes place as the exploration together of different perspectives of how to understand and handle a situation.

In the example here, the work in the whole group with each play was given quite a lot of time. The groups performed their prepared plays and after each one, participants in the whole group in action and verbally explored different ways to handle this situation. It seems that the all the youths' focus for attention lay on the actual problem for a role character in a fictive context. Even though it was expressed that the same thing could take place in real life, the common reflection is constantly on the fictive context. The example used in the following, is about the same scene as created by the youths in the section above.

The participants in the small group are ready to perform their play. Before they start, the drama teacher asks them to present the names of the fictive characters, and they do so. Then they start the play. It is about a group of friends and where group members on several occasions borrow money from one and the same person (the role character is called Bengan)¹²⁶. Each time the one who borrows money promises to give it back the following day. The next day this person says that he/she has forgot it, gives excuses, and asks to borrow some more money from the same person, Bengan who in turn says “-Yes. But you must promise to give me it back tomorrow.” After a promise to do so, money is borrowed.

The fourth day the same thing happens Bengan says:

- Now, where is my money?
 - Shit! I have only twenty crowns, but these... (*Is interrupted by Bengan who shouts:*)
 - Now it is enough! I hate you! (*Bengan runs away crying.*)
- The play stops there.

The drama teacher asks the spectators what they perceived happened in the play. The perception is articulated that the whole gang exploit Bengan. Participants confirm that this problem could also happen in real life. When the group repeat the play, the spectators are given the possibility to say “stop”, replace the person who has the role as Bengan and try out ways how he could get out of this. In the first replacement, Bengan says that he has no

¹²⁶ In this excerpt, the participating youths have not been given names since it is not always possible from the video-recording to discern who says what, since not everyone talking was caught on video camera.

money, but then is revealed that someone in the gang has previously seen him with money, and accuses him of lying. During the discussion is argued that this could lead to a new problem. The teacher asks the group to repeat the play and now with the condition that Bengan actually has money. This time the one who takes the role as Bengan says that he is not allowed to lend his money, and then out of role says that one should say “no”. This leads to a discussion among the youths, both the ones that played the roles and the spectators, about whether one should lend money in the first place, or not. During the discussion, some comments are expressed in front of the whole group while several comments are shared only with a peer sitting nearby. *(Since several discussions were going on simultaneously it is not possible to discern whole sentences, but from isolated words it appears everyone is talking about the actual issue.)* Then the teacher asks why it might be that Bengan in the original play finds it difficult to say “no”. A lively discussion starts about fear not to be part of the gang, group pressure, and what real friendship is about. Again, at this time several discussions are going on simultaneously. [...] (From transcription and field notes from observation, 5 November 2013.)

There was a verbal discussion both in the whole group and between individual peers. A majority of the pupils were participating actively, verbally and/or in action. The spectators were offered the possibility to enter the role as Bengan if they had ideas about how to handle the problem. It seems that it was taken as a possibility, but not as an obligation. In the first replacement of the role as Bengan, one of the co-players inserted the precondition that he actually had no money. This in turn led to the drama teacher challenging the participants by asking them to keep the condition that Bengan has money. The teacher’s question about why Bengan did not say “no” seemed to contribute to further reflections about the issue in that the youths referred to their own experiences and perception about group pressure and what friendship can be. This indicates that the pupils needed support and a challenge from the teacher to raise and evolve their reasoning about aspects of the content beyond the concrete doings in the dramatic action.

The possibility of actively taking part by acting in a fictive context, or verbally in the whole group or in conversation with a peer, connected with the teacher’s active support, with requisite time given for reflection, seem to work together. This is the

only one occasion of work in which a forum play was documented, but nevertheless the analysis of this indicates that the possibility of expressing perceptions as actions, and verbally in different constellations, seemed to contribute to the active participation in reflective inquiry together. It seems to open up to a tentative inquiry of different ways to act and think (see also Österlind, 2011).

The inquiry through Forum play includes creating and examining alternatives of how to understand and handle a situation, and this takes place as a combination of dramatic acting and verbal reflection. Because a point of departure is that a problematic situation needs to be changed, Forum play involves examining the conditions and common assumptions about this in combination with the creation of potential alternatives. In the example above, the lively discussions about why it can be difficult to say “no” indicates such examining. It can be related to Braidotti’s (2010, 2011) reasoning that change requires both creation and critique, including imagining potential consequences, and active engagement in the exploration of alternatives. Through Forum play, this can take place through interconnections of sensory and affective experiencing and thinking together. The working form is based on the view that conditions and subjects change in a mutual process, which contradict the neo-liberal idea that it is the subject who needs to adapt to the market’s requirements.

Based on the analysis of data, the meaning of a specific dramatic action can be seen as created as an interconnection of the content, the dramatic art form as expression for this content, and the possibilities offered for reflection (Bolton, 1992; Fleming, 2001; Sternudd, 2000). This can be related to Deleuze’s (1969/2004), Deleuze and Guattari’s (1980/1988), and Guattari’s (1992/1995) reasoning that what is expressed and how it is expressed are interrelated.

It would be an error to believe that content determines expression by casual action, even if expression is accorded the power not only to “reflect” content but to react upon it in an active way. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 89)

6.3 Summarizing reflections

Throughout this chapter, characteristics for drama education and learning in drama have been highlighted.

In dramatic acting “as if”, participants act simultaneously in a fictive, physical and social context. The fictive context is created on the basis on material offered by the drama teacher, for example a story or theme. The creation together of dramatizations based on these gives possibilities to explore new situations and conditions. Dramatic acting in a fictive role gives freedom for experimentation of another’s perspective, and of new ways to act and think. Thus, drama makes possible an educational experience that concerns the participants through affects, senses, cognition and intra-action with the environment. Their different experiences and knowledge contribute to the common creating of the dramatic action and its meaning. The acting in a fictive context opens up for an experimentation of different perspectives, and so contributes to an expanding understanding about both unfamiliar situations and potential ways to ways to act and think in everyday life. Thereby, experiences in drama education can be linked to other parts of life. The pupils are considered as active co-constructors of knowledge. They are not positioned as someone expected to submit to and perform in accordance with predetermined requirements that the dominating educational practice in Sweden tends to contribute to.

The focus on collective processes in drama differs from the prevailing individualization in Swedish school education. Because both the dramatic action and its meaning are created as a common process, this involves both collective and individual learning. The possibilities to participate in varied ways in the creation of a dramatization contribute to this. The pupils intra-act through acting in role, verbal negotiation, reflecting together, and by taking different role functions.

7. Improvisation within drama education

In this chapter, I enquire into how learning takes place in improvisation as a working form within drama education, and what is then learned. As I said earlier, improvisation is a significant component in dramatic acting (see for example Bolton, 1984, 1998; Courtney, 1990, 1995). As I highlighted in the previous chapter, creating dramatic action takes place as an ongoing process here-and-now. It involves a lot of actions not planned in advance.

Improvisation can be understood as an encounter with something unpredictable, whereby one cannot plan in advance how to respond in doings and sayings. “The unpredictable, what we cannot know in advance is fundamental for all improvisation” (Øksnes, 2006, p. 317)¹²⁷. Improvisation as such is not unique for drama but is also done in, for example, ordinary conversations, music performances and play (Sawyer, 2000). However, what is specific for drama is that it is done as bodily interaction in the fictive and social context. In school education in Sweden, the dominating focus on achievements of standardized knowledge requirements tends not to allow for giving attention to the unexpected that occurs here-and-now. “The education is getting more and more governed by the expected results and makes it hard for the teacher to justify excursions beside a straight path towards the requirement levels” (Carlgren, 2014, p. 4).¹²⁸ The component of improvisation contributes to the participant in this study perceiving of drama education as different.

7.1 Openness for the unpredictable

Improvisation recurs many times in my data from interviews and observations. In interviews, youths express the view that improvisation is fun because they do not know what will happen. This indicates that improvisation is perceived of as significant in drama education, and that this is connected with a preparedness to deal with unpredictability, that one does not know what will happen.

¹²⁷ [“Det uforutsette, det vi ikke kan vite noe om på forhånd er grunnleggende for all improvisasjon” (Øksnes, 2006, p. 317).]

¹²⁸ [“Undervisningen blir alltmer styrd av de förväntade resultaten och läraren får svårt att motivera utflykter vid sidan av en raka väg mot kravnivåerna” (Carlgren, 2014, p. 4).]

Det är väldigt kul med improvisation. Där kan man bara ... improvisera och hamna på ett helt annat ställe. Från att vara i en dramasal så kan jag till exempel hamna på ett sjukhus eller ett bilservice-ställe, var som helst... Det är som att resa. Vi får olika scener och kan hamna var som helst.

It's very fun with improvisation. There you can just... improvise and end up in a completely different place. From being in a drama room, I can for example end up at a hospital or a car service place, anywhere. It is like travelling. We get different scenes and can end up anywhere. (Ryan, interview 1: 17)

Det roligaste är nog när man får bestämma själv vad man ska göra, vad man ska säga. Improvisation, såna här övningar vi får göra... Det är kul när man inte vet vad som ska hända.

The most fun is probably when you can decide yourself what to do, what to say. Improvisation, these kinds of exercises we can do ... It is fun when you don't know what will happen. (Mio, interview 1: 19)

According to what appears in interview data, improvisation can be perceived as both fun, difficult and slightly scary, simultaneously. This is exemplified by Helle's statement:

Det är innan [man improviserar] som man är nervös. När man väl kommer upp och gör det är det jätteroligt. Och efter, då vill man göra det igen.

You are nervous before [you improvise]. Once you come up and do it, it is very fun. And afterwards, then you want to do it again. (Helle, interview I: 1)

Youths connect improvisation with learning "to dare":

Jag har lärt mig att improvisera. Att våga och inte vara så blyg.

I have learned to improvise. To dare and not be so shy. (Deniz, interview I: 11)

När man improviserar lär man sig att våga prata och våga göra saker, visa sina känslor [...] Man kan visa sina känslor utan att skämmas.

When you improvise you learn to dare to talk and dare to do things, express feelings [...] You can show your feelings without being ashamed. (Misha, interview II: 2)

According to my reading of the data, “to dare” is connected with improvisation in that it is to spontaneously come up with things and respond to the other’s actions, and thereby it involves a preparedness to cope with uncertainty. It appears that an engagement in improvisations is related to a willingness to be open for the surprising and to plunge into the here-and-now (see Johnstone, 1979).

The immediate actions and responses to impulses require presence and awareness (both sensuous and mental) in the actual situation. Thus, improvisation takes place as a communicative interaction here-and-now (Sawyer, 2000, 2011). This, in turn, relates to Johnstone’s (1979) idea that improvisation involves being open for and accepting each other’s offers. Improvisation can also be understood as intuitive actions. Intuition is defined here as the making of an immediate understanding or judgement without conscious reasoning (Courtney, 1990; Damasio, 1994; Semetsky, 2006). It is based on implicit memories of previous sensory-based experiences (Damasio, 1994). Thereby, improvisation can be seen as a commitment with and response to someone/something unpredictable, and where experience-based knowledge and judgement are actualized in an immediate and creative way. Experience-based knowledge is previously acquired knowledge that might not have been made conscious (Semetsky, 2006)¹²⁹. I have earlier discussed that previous knowing is used as means to create new knowledge, and thus it includes both implicit and explicit knowing. In this way, learning processes involve intuition.

In the drama classes participating in this study, improvisation was about a collaboratively created play without a script, and then with given frames for the play, as a process of creating a play from scratch. Participants said that they improvise a great deal in dramatized plays for audiences. However, in this study, I have not followed every single group’s entire working process with dramatizations from the beginning to meeting with an audience. Additionally, observation data does not

¹²⁹ This might be described as *tacit knowledge*, a concept deriving from Michael Polanyi (1958/1998). However, because I do not use him as reference in this thesis, I do not use the concept either.

always catch what were unprepared actions and what was planned in advance, because some actions might have been prepared by a participant without informing the others in the group. Nor did I ask about this in the interviews, and this is a weakness in the research study.

According to the data, improvisation was also about work with improvisation exercises and games that were not connected with another thematic issue. The teachers' purpose to introduce them was to provide opportunities to focus explicitly on improvisation as a working form. The games and exercises have a clearly structured frame and the participants were not acting in specific dramatic roles. A basic idea is that the participants have to act spontaneously. From this, it follows that documented observation data of improvisational acts from such occasion can be analyzed as spontaneous acts. In the next section, I undertake a close analysis of one improvisation game, having a focus on learning.

7.1.1 The example improvisation game Hitchhiker

In this section, the improvisation game *Hitchhiker*¹³⁰ is used in order to elicit different aspects of learning in and through improvisation. This game is frequently mentioned in interviews in this study and also recurs in the observation data.

In the example used here, four youths conversed about situations in drama education that they wanted to highlight. They especially highlighted the improvisation game *Hitchhiker*, and said it was fun because it was exiting to not know in advance which emotion a new hitchhiker brought in, and they could express the emotions exaggeratedly. Then the youths, in one and same interview, decided to actively perform this with the purpose to illustrate what it could be like. I use this example because different aspects of improvisation appear.

¹³⁰ The improvisation game *Hitchhiker* is well known among drama practitioners and can aim, for example, to work with the bodily expression of emotions, to pay attention to and accept others' ideas, or to be a point of departure for a discussion about how we affect others and are affected by others' attitudes and behavior. However, I have not managed to find its origin.

A description of *Hitchhiker*: Four chairs represent a car. Four participants sit in the car, and one drives. Another participant becomes a hitchhiker. The car stops, the hitchhiker enters, and the driver goes out from the car and every one changes places so someone else becomes the driver. The hitchhiker has a particular emotion, which all in the car adopt. The actual emotion is not presented in advance, and thereby the other passengers in the car quickly have to change their expressions of emotions. Other hitchhikers come, each with their own emotions, taken by all the passengers in the car, and so on...

The following excerpt derives from the beginning of the game:

Four chairs have been placed as a car. Conny and Lee are passengers and Joni is the driver. The improvisation starts with everyday chatting among the three in the car. Tim is hitchhiking, the car is stopped and the newcomer enters.

Tim: *(with an irritated voice)* -Damn, I am angry!

Lee and Conny turn their bodies and gaze toward Tim, while Joni turns her head and gaze, and illustrates at the same time with her arms that the car is controlled. All three stop totally for one hundredth of a second. Then Lee and Joni simultaneously start to talk with angry and exaggerated voices and Tim gets into the altercation. They talk over each other. *(In the recording is it not possible to hear more than single words, as “the whole time” and “Stop!”.)* Simultaneously they used angry facial expressions interrupted now and then by smiles. Tim pushes gently Conny’s arm, and says something *(not possible to hear what)*. (From transcript from video-recording, 13 February 2015.)

The participants were directed toward each other with bodies and gazes. According to the analysis, there was an intense focus on all the other participants in the car. When Tim entered as a hitchhiker, all the others stopped for a short moment. This game implies that a hitchhiker introduces a new emotion, which is not known in advance by the others. This seems to be a moment of excitement. The short moment of silence indicates that they directed all their attention towards what is coming. Here, the participants were prepared for the unpredictable new emotion, and this seems to lead to commitment and a focused attention in the situation. The structure of the game constituted a clear frame, and thereby participants could concentrate fully on the introduction of and interplay with different expressions of emotions. Simultaneously the clear structure of the game seems to produce attention and to encourage different ways to express emotions, as when participants in actual example used exaggerated voices. This can be understood as that the exploration of expressions is encouraged by “the dynamic tension between known (safe) processes and unknown (risky) outcomes” (Hunter, 2008, p. 8).

In the example above, Lee and Joni quickly took the emotion of anger that Tim brought in, and all three quarreled using exaggerated voices. My reading of the data

is that they were intensely committed to this, and the smiles indicate that they perceived it as fun. It can be connected to the discussion in the section 5.1.2.2 about prevailing norms how to behave as a good pupil (see Ball, Maguire & Braun, 2012; Foucault, 1982). This includes being able to control one's emotional expressions, for example anger. The improvisation game can be understood as a space where the subject does not have to suppress her emotions and expressions of these. This, in turn, relates to Johnstone's (1979) argument that we often censor our spontaneous impulses of how to act in ordinary life and that this leads to us suppressing our creativity. In improvisations, the participants can be open for and follow impulses, and play with ideas. However, as Johnstone (ibid.) points out, the improviser is aware of what she is doing. I understand this as that she can feel free within the improvisations to follow impulses but in the actual acts with ethical responsibility in relation to the co-actors. (This will further discussed later in this section.)

In the data, it appears that improvisation simultaneously is about to express oneself and about responsiveness in social interaction.

The exploration of different expressions and ways to express something in improvisations are interwoven with social interaction.¹³¹ In the example from the improvisation game *Hitchhiker*, different aspects of the interplay between participants' doings in relation to each other and the action appears. In the following, there is a continuation of the sequence with one hitchhiker, and as mentioned above this is about expressing the emotion "anger":

Tim pushes gently Conny's arm, and says something (*not possible to hear what*).

Conny says nothing but looks focused on the others.

Joni: -Read the map instead.

Lee: -What do you mean with reading the map?

Joni turns back toward Lee and Tim, and stops for a moment to illustrate with her arms that the car is controlled. Then Joni moves the arms again as if controlling the car, but with her head and gaze directed towards them behind.

Lee (*to Joni*): -But look at the road.

¹³¹ The participants' private relations as peers is not in focus in this study.

Tim: -The road!

Joni now turns towards Tim, still with her arms lifted as if controlling the car.

Conny holds a hand over his mouth and looks very amused.

Tim puts gently his hands on Joni's shoulders, and tries to persuade her to turn forward.

Lee (*almost screaming*): -The road!

Joni: -Oh, I get so mad at you.

Tim again tries to persuade Joni to turn forward by putting his hands on Joni's shoulders. Joni now stops to "control the car" and turns towards Tim.

Joni: -Drive the car yourself.

Tim: -No.

Lee: -He just entered here. You don't have to be so unkind.

Conny turns forward, away from the others and looks towards the floor, and keeps this position for three seconds. Then turns towards the others again and look at them.

Tim: -Exactly, don't be so unkind. Control yourself.

Joni (*sighs and put her hands on her face*): -You are so ignorant all of you.

Tim (*puts his hands on Joni's shoulders again*): -The road!

Joni: -No, no, I will not...

Tim lifts his hands in a pleading gesture and says something (*not possible to hear what*).

Conny (*lifts an arm with an open hand, and talks with an angry voice and is almost beginning to laugh*): -We will die.

Joni: -I don't care.

Conny (*to Joni*): -Stop it!

Conny lowers his arm, turns forward and looks towards the floor. Joni freeze for a moment and looks at Conny using a surprised expression.

Joni (*turns towards Tim*): -You can't come in here and just... OOOH.

(*Wave simultaneously with her arms.*)

At the same time, Conny turns towards the others again.

Tim: -Yes.

Lee: -You let him in. What shall he do? He stood on the street and wanted help.

Joni: -Yes, so what?

Conny: -It... (*Is interrupted by Lee.*)

Lee (*to Joni*): - Don't you have any compassion?

Tim: -Exactly.

Everyone follows with their gazes all the other's doings.

Joni: -No.

Lee: -I notice this. But you have to get that.

Joni (*sighs and turns toward Lee*): -Just read the map so I know how to drive.

Tim (*pushes gently Conny's arm*): -Youuu!

Conny (*to Tim*): -Be quiet!

Lee: - It is he that should read the map. (*Pushes gently Conny's shoulder.*)

Joni (to Conny): -Read the map.

Conny: -Me? I should not think so, it is he who should. (*Points at Tim.*)

Joni (*lifts her arm and points in the driving direction*): -I try to drive (*not possible to hear the continuation of the sentence*). Read the map. (*To Conny.*)

Conny lifts his arms in an averting gesture.

Joni: -Read the map. Right or left?

Conny focuses on the driving direction.

Joni: - Right or left?

Conny points in a direction. Joni illustrates clearly with her arms that the car is controlled.

Here the situation is interrupted because a new hitchhiker enters. (From transcript from video-recording, 13 February 2015. The sequence lasts for 1 minutes and 7 seconds.)

The aspects that appear of the interplay between participants' doings in relation to each other and the actions within the improvisation, according to my reading of the data, are the use of different strategies to enter into the play, the interrelation between the actual and the fiction, and a displacement from undirected expressions to a collective creation of a common problem. These aspects will be now considered one by one.

In the earlier excerpt, it appeared that Joni and Lee immediately threw themselves into the action and began to argue with angry voices. It is difficult to hear what they say, but from the discernable words, it seems to be about how to express oneself with an irritated attitude more than about what is said. This strategy can be understood as a doing of emotion as an exterior, physical expression. In the latter sequence, Conny

used the different strategy to initially watch and listen to the others. Then, Conny turned his body and gaze away from the others, and remained in this position for some seconds. This can be understood as a very brief moment of “stop-and-think” on the action (Dewey, 1938/1997, p. 64). After this Conny again turned to the others and entered into the action verbally and with an utterance with a specific content related to what the action is about: “We can die.” This strategy might be about needing a short time span to capture the situation and how to attend to it. Conny entered the action when content for the discussion has emerged: in this case that the driver must pay attention to the way she is driving. This might imply that a prerequisite for Conny’s attendance is that there was a specified content for the communication. It might also have to do with timing, and that is to say to enter into the play when one can give a contribution to how the action proceeds. Thus, it seems that an improvisation game can include different strategies to enter into the action, and that these strategies are evolved by the subject within the actual context (see Johnstone, 1979). In this example, Conny did not enter into the exterior action immediately, but once there he improvised in intra-action with the others. From this it can be understood that the improvisation allowed for varied ways to approach one and same action.

In one more occasion, Conny turned away from the others for a short moment, directly after the utterance “Stop it!”. The attempt to change the situation by saying that they could die did not persuade Joni to pay attention to driving, and it seems that the utterance “Stop it!” was one more intention to influence the situation. Conny said this with an angry voice but was simultaneously almost beginning to laugh. This might be because the doing is somewhat embarrassing. This is the only occasion in this sequence when Joni froze for a moment and looked at Conny with a surprised expression. These factors together might indicate that Conny’s active intent to change the situation is something new for him, that he here extends his action space. Later on, Conny said “Be quiet!” to Tim, now with an angry expression. This time, he kept his focus on the action, and Tim became silent and stopped pushing him. The improvisation game seems to be a space here to try out a new way to act. That Conny the first time almost laughs and in a short moment turned away from the others might indicate that the active intent to change the situation in the fictive context was also a new experience in the reality of everyday life. For a short moment, Conny stepped

out from the fictive action. In Deluzian (1995/2001) terms, this can be described a potentiality being transformed into an actualization, into something that can be perceived as an action in everyday life.

Otherwise, the participants seem to keep an expression of the given emotion during the whole sequence. They expressed “angry” with voices and words, some physical movements and physical contact. The physical contacts appear as gently performed, and this analysis is based on that in the video-recording there appeared cautious touching, which the one who is touched does not seem to avert from, or react to with a facial expression of discomfort. The verbal utterances do not lead to responses (physical or verbal) that could indicate that the words are meant to actually hurt. This conclusion is supported by my memories from the situation, and by that the youths’ interactions before and after this sequence did not express any irritation or discomfort. These factors indicate together that the emotion “angry” was done as an exterior expression, and that the participants did not step into the emotion and intend to incorporate it as a real feeling. Thereby, the irritated expressions and mean comments did not spread to participants’ ordinary life relations. They act in an in-between space, but the actual context and the fiction are not fused (Courtney, 1995; O’Toole, 1992). This can be understood as a double consciousness about fiction and actual life (Bolton, 1984; Østern & Heikkinen, 2001), together with a caring for each other as a doing in practice (Nicholson, 2002).

The improvised action is constructed successively and collectively. The first impulse seems to be that Joni stopped to look in the driving direction because the verbal discussion is intense. Lee observed this action and reacted “But look at the road”, and this led to Tim also putting his focus on the need to look at the road when one is driving, and takes part in the communication both verbally and physically. Joni responded by refusing to do this, by accusing Tim of having caused the situation, and after a while also stopping “driving the car”. Conny now entered into the action and tried to make a change by putting the focus on the probable consequence that they would die if the driver did not pay attention to the control of the car. The participants with different contributions together constructed a dramatic tension in the action. Joni repeated that someone had to read the map, so that they could know the

direction to drive. Thereby, the need to put focus on the road when one is driving and the need to know where to drive became interconnected parts of the problem.

This sequence of improvisation started in a non-directed doing, as a non-sense (Deleuze, 1969/2004). This implies that the action to go by car is a means for improvisation about expressions of emotions. Successively, a previously not defined meaning (sense) of the action is created together by the participants as a communicative interaction.

Even though the example above deals with just a short sequence of a very basic improvisation, different aspects of interaction in relation to the activity appear. Participants used different strategies to enter into the play. There is a displacement from undirected expressions to a collective construction of an action. Meaning is not something predefined that participant should acquire but is produced in relation to the actual activity or phenomenon and require an openness for the unexpected (Deleuze, 1969/2004; Dewey, 1933). In line with Deleuze's (1968/2004) reasoning, I suggest that the production of meaning takes place in a process involving affective and sensory experiencing and thinking. It "presupposes an impulse, a compulsion to think which passes through all sort of bifurcations, spreading from the nerves and being communicated to the soul in order to arrive at thought" (Deleuze, 1968/2004, pp. 184-185). To delimit instead the knowledge content with what it is possible to assess with pre-formulated requirements, as seems often be the case within Swedish school education (see for example Carlgren, 2014), might close down the process as an endeavor to acquire these requirements.

7.1.2 To listen with various senses

Improvisation is simultaneously about expressing oneself and about responsiveness for the other's expressions. Torild and Vanja connected this with the view that improvisation is both fun and difficult:

Torild: -Det svåraste var när vi skulle prata Gibberish¹³². Jag höll på med en grej, men då förstod du liksom inte vad jag höll på med. (Torild

¹³² Gibberish is an improvisation exercise where the participants use sounds, utterances and gestures but no verbal speech. (See for example Spolin, 1963/1983.)

turns toward Vanja.) Och vi var där uppe ganska länge, och jag försökte förklara vad det var.

-The most difficult was when we were to talk Gibberish. I was doing something, but then you like did not understand what I was doing. (Torild turns toward Vanja.) And we were up there for quite a long time, and I tried to explain what it was.

Vanja: -Ja, det var du och jag. Det var kul, men det var SÅ svårt... Det var väl typ att du skulle gräva?

-Yes, it was you and me. It was fun, but it was SO difficult... Was it not like that you should dig?

Torild: -Ja, jag skulle gräva.

Yes, I should dig.

Vanja: -Och jag förstod inte. Men det var SÅ kul.

-And I did not understand. But it was SO fun.

Torild: -Ja. Och så fick man inte prata. Eller, vi fick prata, men inte säga ord. Så vi skulle förklara med rörelser och så.

-And we were not allowed to talk. Or, we were allowed to talk, but not to say words. We should explain with gestures and so on.

Vanja: -Och tonfall och så.

-And tones and so on.

Torild: -Ja.

-Yes.

Vanja: -Och då är det det här att kunna tolka varandra, och det kan vara svårt ibland. Men det tror jag man kan bli bättre på när man har drama som ett ämne. Då blir man bättre på det.

-And then it is this about interpreting each other, and this can sometimes be very difficult. But I think you can get better at this when you have drama as a subject. Then you get better at this.

(Torild and Vanja, interview I: 20)

This improvisation exercise is about interpreting and responding to the other's communicative acts. The participant interprets the other's gestures, moves and sounds, and translate this to verbal talk, and the other in turn responds to this in the continued action. To be open for what the other expresses is about listening to and interpreting gestures, movements, sound and words. This can be understood as a listening with both hearing and seeing. It is also about accepting and responding to

the other (Johnstone, 1979). This can be related to the previously highlighted improvisation game *Hitch Hiker*, where it appears that the dramatic action was successively created by the participants' expressions and responses. The interpretation and responding adds something to the action, and thereby this was co-created.

Thus, listening is a significant component in improvisation in the participating classes, and the listening includes various senses. To listen and respond to the other and the actual situation, includes an attunement to the situation and to (other's) mood (Sawyer, 2011). It involves giving space for the other.

7.2 Summarizing reflections

In this chapter, the act of improvisation as a relational doing here-and-now, and contributing aspects that appear in data have been emphasized. Improvisation seems to contribute to learning concerning social interplay, to be involved in a situation here-and-now, and listening with various senses. I have also highlighted that improvisation can be connected with a preparedness to deal with unpredictability, or as it is articulated by the youths, that "one does not know what will happen". Thus, improvisation seems to contribute to curiosity about what should happen, and contribute to a focused attention and openness for the unpredictable, for the *yet not is* (Deleuze, 1968/2004). Thereby, improvisation as an inherent part of drama activities can be seen as a counterpoint to the focus on preset knowledge requirements and outcomes that tends to be prevailing within school education.

Taken together, through this and the previous chapter, it appears that in drama education the emphasis lies on creating and that it includes improvisation implies that the process contains unpredictability. This promote participants' curiosity and engagement. It can also contribute to the construction of new and unforeseen knowledge. In drama, learning takes place as meaning creation, which implies that it is done as a collective and contextual process. What is central is that learning takes place through the exploration of potential ways to act and become. Drama education includes learning processes about the dramatic content and theme, and about each other, one self, others and social interplay. Learning take place as processes of interconnections of sensations, affects, cognition and actions, and verbal

communication. These components are not only integrated in the processes: they do the processes. (They do this together with other active components that have not been focused on in the present thesis, including for example the social relations between the youths.) In this way, drama education can be understood as events for learning and potential becoming. This argument leads on to an overall discussion of what this can imply, and of how drama can constitute a complement to otherwise realized school education in Sweden, which is provided in the next chapter.

8. Summary of the discussion

The overall aim of the research study presented in this thesis was to contribute to knowledge about what drama can be, and how learning takes place in drama education when it constitutes a recurring part of compulsory schooling in Sweden. A sub-aim was to produce understanding concerning the components that co-produce such learning. In this chapter, I synchronize what has been mapped in the previous chapters and further discuss this in order to answer the research questions.

The chapter highlights what characterizes drama education when realized within the current compulsory school system in Sweden. It also addresses what drama can be when encountering the prevailing educational orientation that is constricted by a results-oriented discourse. The research question of how learning processes in drama can be understood through a post-constructionist perspective has guided the analysis in the previous chapters and will be highlighted also in the present one. The research question about which components are active in learning processes in drama education, and how these are interconnected, has guided the analysis of data provided in the chapters 5, 6 and 7. I summarize the conclusions in the present chapter. The question of how learning in and through drama is perceived by participating pupils, has been highlighted particularly in section 5.1.2, and is then recurrently discussed throughout chapters 5, 6 and 7.

In this chapter, the research questions are not answered one by one. Instead, I return to them in an iterated form and in interconnection with each other in order to highlight different aspects. The question of how learning processes in drama can be understood through a post-constructionist perspective refers both to how such processes appear in the analysis of data, and to this theoretical approach as a tool to capture learning processes in drama. The latter will be discussed in section 8.4.

Throughout this chapter, conclusions drawn from the study are presented. Finally, I consider the implications for drama education as a scheduled subject within compulsory schooling in Sweden.

8.1 Drama as events of knowing and potential becoming

In section 3.4 in this thesis, the concept of *event* is defined as an encounter of involved agents (Deleuze (1969/2004)). To recap, an event is not about a passage

between a 'before' and a 'after', a delimited situation, because it actualizes both what has been and potentialities. These processes of actualization are non-linear, but move in all directions: earlier experiences and memories are used: potential possibilities are imagined: and alternative ways to act and think are created (Braidotti, 2010; Deleuze, 1969/2004). An event can be seen as an encounter between converging processes, and thereby there is ongoing change. The meaning is created in the encounter. This has relevance for drama because participants' different experiences and perceptions can be actualized through the creation of a fictive context, meanings produced through this, and the exploration of potential ways to act and think. This definition of *event* has been combined with Foucault's (1991) idea that an event can be constituted of multiple processes. In this thesis, it has been demonstrated that drama education can for example be about simultaneous processes of creating a dramatic action and social interplay (see section 6.1.4).

An event is not seen as a delimited situation also in the sense that it communicates with other events (Deleuze, 1969/2004; Foucault, 1991). Events are always working on the same immanent plane. In the present study, it has been shown that different school subjects affect each other, as in the earlier provided example about a test in a compulsory subject and how this also affects pupils' focus of attention in drama education (section 5.1.4.1). This example illuminates interconnections of policy on micro- and macro-level in that the focus on results in national educational policy leads to the organization of the ordinary school education being governed by knowledge requirements and to test where the pupils are in relation to these. The tests are given major importance, and each individual pupil is expected to perform well in these. This, in turn, might lead to the pupil not being fully concentrated on a drama activity taking place in a drama lesson scheduled close to another academic subject where a test is given. In this way, the educational events in drama and in the other subject are interrelated.

This definition of the concept *event* is useful in a discussion about drama because it can comprise different processes simultaneously going on within an educational occasion, and can include interrelations with other events. That is to say, it can comprise both different processes of learning in drama and different components contributing to what drama education can be within compulsory school. As Olsson

(2008, p. 115) formulates it, an event is a conceptual tool with which to deal with educational activities as “complex and open ended events in movement”.

In the following sections, I use the concept of event in relation to a discussion about concrete drama educational sessions.

8.1.1 Immanence of drama education

The view that events are working on the same immanent plane implies, among other things, that school education is not considered as separated from the rest of the pupils’ lives. In this section, I emphasize how this contributes to learning processes in drama, and how drama thereby differs from otherwise realized school education.

In the data from interviews, the participants draw connections between learning through experiences in drama and other parts of life. This has, for example, been demonstrated through the view that experiences of empathizing with a role can be brought to other situations in life (section 5.1.2.1), and that earlier experiences are used and combined in the drama work and contribute to understanding what an individual can do in order to stop bullying (section 6.2). This illuminates that what takes place in drama education works together with earlier experiences, other experiences in life, and possible ways to act and think in other situations and in the future. So far, my argument converges with conclusions drawn by other drama researchers, which has been highlighted in the presentation of research studies by Henry (2000) and Sæbø (2009), (see section 1.2.3).

However, my data also demonstrate that experiences in drama and in other parts of life are interconnected: in other words, they are working on the same immanent plane. Thus, to relate my argument to Deleuze’s reasoning about immanence sheds new light on how learning processes in drama can be understood. This approach to drama education differs radically from the idea that dramatic actions are representations that are sometimes articulated within the drama field (see for example Bolton, 1992, 1998; Courtney, 1990). According to this idea, a dramatic action is a representation of a reality existing ‘outside’. As Bolton (1998, p. 251) explains, it is a person’s “understanding of, not a facsimile of, a reality”.

In sections 3.2 and 3.3.1, I referred to Deleuze's (1995/2001) idea that there is no fundamental principle beyond the empirical world, and thus that everything is working on the same immanent plane. All is "A LIFE" (ibid., p. 27). What we perceive and know (the actual), memories of earlier experiences and what potentially can be (the virtual) are realities working on the immanent plane. The interrelation of these realities is horizontal and non-dichotomous. This leads on to the argument that what has taken place before, the potential possible that is actualized here-and-now and what might be in other parts of life or in the future, are active in the same drama education event. These interrelations are working in learning processes through dramatic acting. (Together with the subjects' sensory and affective experiencing, reflection and exterior interaction with others and the physical space, which will be discussed in the following section 8.1.3.) In drama processes, learning takes place through the subject's re-working of earlier experiences (Braidotti, 2013), and use of previous knowing and imagination in a common creation of a dramatic action and its meaning. In this process, virtualities can be actualized as tentative and affective experimenting in dramatic actions. As Deleuze (1977/2002) points out, when potential ways to act are tried in action, virtualities are temporary actualized. This, together with the reflection the action gives rise to, might contribute to an expanded knowing and preparedness to act in other parts of life. It implies, among other things, that what takes place in dramatic acting does not represent something "outside". Knowledge is not something pre-existing that is supplied: it is produced in the encounter. (See also sections 6.1.5 and 8.1.3 for discussions about virtual and actual in relation to the data produced about dramatic acting in role.)

This has certain correspondence with a view that dramatic action implies a creative process of inquiry and change which Rasmussen (2008, p. 315) refers to as "mimesis of creative interaction" (see also section 1.4.2 in this thesis). He discusses this in relation to different ways in which the concept of mimesis is defined within the drama field. According to this view, there is a non-hierarchical relation between the components active in dramatic acting. Dramatic acting is considered as a creative inquiry through which both the participants and the understanding of the thematic content of dramatic action might be changed. However, Rasmussen does not discuss the relation between virtual and actual.

Courtney (1990), on the other hand, uses the term actual in relation to fiction and acting “as if” in drama. He argues that dramatic acting in a fictive context can be about trying possible beings and alternatives for the actual world. He connects this with a view that fiction “functions as a metaphor of the actual life” (Courtney, 1995, p. 24) and that dramatic acting is representation of these metaphors. (See also section 1.2.3.1.)

However, this view about the dramatic action as a representation is opposed the idea that drama education works on the plane of immanence. The former would be to consider dramatic action as receding to something “outside” and that this is a stable entity. Representation “has only a unique and receding perspective, and [...] moves nothing” (Deleuze, 1968/2004, p. 67). Rasmussen (2008) points out that dramatic action understood as a representation implies that it refers to something external, and that the relation between the represented and the representation is hierarchical. It is hierarchical in that the represented contains the truth that the dramatic action mediates. According to this, dramatic acting would contribute to acquisition of what already is known. As I said in section 3.3.1, this is a circular move back to more knowledge about what is already known. It relates to Deleuze’s (1968/2004) argument that representation is a difference from the represented, and thus is connected to dichotomous thinking.

The actual and virtual are non-dichotomously interconnected. Thereby, drama education can be seen as an event working on the immanent plane, and through dramatic acting, new knowledge can be produced. One conclusion drawn in this study is that drama education can be a non-dichotomous practice. That the participants are reworking earlier experiences, use their knowing in the creation of a dramatic action, and experiment different perspectives and potentialities implies that they are active co-constructors of knowledge production. In this thesis, the idea about active contribution has been discussed in relation to data about the pupils’ collectively creating a dramatization and their contribution to the common work by using different strategies (section 6.1.3). Thus, another conclusion is that drama education provides learning processes in which the pupils’ earlier experiences and knowing are active and taken into account in the creation and exploration of dramatic actions.

That the pupils are considered as co-constructors of knowledge and are engaging in a collective process implies that the outcomes are not predictable. This makes drama different from the prevailing educational practice in Sweden that tends to be governed by a results-orientation. As I have discussed in this thesis (section 2.2.6), a results-orientation implies that the focus lies on the acquisition and assessment of pre-formulated knowledge. This leads to an emphasis on knowledge that it is possible to measure and compare. The knowledge requirements are formulated in the syllabuses for the compulsory subjects that are included in the Swedish curriculum for compulsory school (Lgr 11). These requirements govern the organization of education (Carlgren, 2014; Wahlström & Sundberg, 2015), (see also section 1.2.1). Thus, the education is organized in order to lead to the fulfillment of preset knowledge requirements. That is to say, the focus lies on what should be learned and the contextual conditions, and the educational process becomes sub-ordinated. Space is not provided for an inquiry into different perspectives and connections (Carlgren, 2014). This produces a pupil as a performer of preset knowledge and as someone who is supposed to submit to the given order. Thereby a dichotomy is produced in that the emphasis lies on results but not on processes, and school education becomes separated from other parts of life.

Drama education and education in other school subjects offer different ways of knowing and emphasize different knowledge: thus they are manifestations of different knowledge discourses (see also section 5.1.2). On a local level, these discursive practices are co-existing, and the pupils move between them. I have discussed in the thesis that the pupils perceive drama and learning through drama as different from otherwise realized school education (section 5.1). Based on a nomad philosophical approach, the individual's moves between open up possibilities for displacement and the re-negotiation of understanding of both herself and what education can be about (Braidotti, 2006; Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988).

8.1.2 Interconnections of art form, content and processes of becoming.

Throughout the thesis, I have emphasized how the dramatic art form, content and processes of becoming manifest and iterate in drama educational practices. Concerning drama as art form, focus has been on acting in role and improvisation. As I mentioned in section 1.1.2, these components are always active in drama but can

be more or less foregrounded. This has been discussed by several drama researchers, for example Bolton (1992), Sæbø (2009) and Sternudd (2000). However, I argue that that they are not only active but also interconnected. In section 1.1.2, the concept of *interconnection* was described as a process of movement forces through which the active components are interrelated. It implies that the components continuously mutually affect each other (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988). This has relevance here because it points towards the significance of taking into account all these components in drama education. In this thesis, I have discussed that the use of the dramatic form, the content of the dramatic action, and experiences of who the subject can be and become appear to be continuously present both as interconnected components in drama events, and as what knowing can be about. In the following, I briefly summarize how these are interconnected and contribute to learning in and through drama.

Dramatic acting in a role “as if” is among other things, about a simultaneous exploration of a fictive context and the taken role. Because the activity simultaneously takes place in an actual context, as a physical and social action, the creation of a dramatic context and acting in this implies a temporary actualization of potentialities. The double consciousness of both the fictive and the actual context, and of both oneself and co-actors, opens up for the exploration of different perspectives and the creation of new ways to act (Bolton, 1984, 1992; Østern & Heikkinen, 2001). Through the dramatic form, learning can take place about both the thematic content of the dramatic action and about who oneself can be and become. That improvisation constitutes a significant part of dramatic acting contributes to creation and exploration together taking place as an ongoing process. This is because improvisation involves an intense presence, and a preparedness to respond to co-actors’ actions and to the unpredictable (Johnstone, 1979; Sawyer, 2000, 2011). This can contribute to a creative experimentation of different potentialities of how to act and deal with different situations and issues in other parts of life.

The creation of a dramatic action and social interaction are interdependent and simultaneous ongoing processes (Neelands, 2009; Nicholson, 2002). Thereby, learning can also take place about social interplay. In the data from observations, it appears that group work about the creation of dramatization offers possibilities to interact in different ways. In different working sessions, the participants take different dramatic roles. This in turn can offer diverse ways to explore potential

becomings, as a part of drama education. Having drama education recurrently provides possibilities to experiment various alternative ways to act and think. Additionally, the participants in different working sessions work with different peers, whereby they partake of a diversity of perceptions and knowing through the common creation of dramatizations. It makes possible space-time for the participants to contribute with, and explore and reflect on different perspectives on phenomena and thematic matters through dramatic acting.

When the thematic content of a drama work is made explicit through conscious reflection together, the pupils highlight in interviews that drama education has provided learning concerning this content (see section 6.2). As an educational practice in the drama classrooms, the content is always a present component but, as I have discussed in the thesis, it appears that the component content is not always made explicit for the pupils. This points out that even though the participants are intensively working with the dramatic content through creating and acting, it additionally has to be made explicit through common reflection (see Sternudd, 2000, 2017). It might be related to a romantic idea that drama is a sensory and emotional experiencing that should not be broken apart theoretically (Sæbø, 2009), (see also section 5.1.3). This might imply a risk that the individual is left to connect the experiences in drama with their own pre-understanding about the content and thereby is not given the possibility to create a new and expanded understanding (Bolton, 1984; Sternudd, 2017). It relates to Deleuze's (1990/1995) argument that learning requires percept, affect and concept, and that all three of them are included.

When drama is scheduled as a recurrent part of school education, space-time is provided for learning in the dramatic art form, and learning concerning the content through dramatic acting. Simultaneously the participants can explore different potential becomings through the dramatic acting. One conclusion drawn in this study is that when drama education includes learning concerning all the components, this contributes to them working together in the production of knowledge. Thereby, concrete drama educational events open up for complex learning processes including an inquiry into different connections and perspectives and an experimentation of different actions and as moves between what is known and what potentially might be.

That all the components are actively present simultaneously and are taken into consideration differ from the fragmentation that appears in the earlier provided analysis of how drama is generally practiced in Swedish compulsory school today (chapter 2). I emphasize there that drama is mostly practiced as a method for value-related issues *or* as an art expression. In connection with a compulsory subject, drama is used mostly as an instrumental method, and then minimal attention is given to how to use the art form's specific skills and techniques. As Sæbø (2009) points out, when drama is just used occasionally as a method, the lack of knowing how to use drama techniques might imply the pupils have a unilateral focus on trying this out. In her study, different situations also appear where pupils were given the task to create dramatizations in small groups, but where they were neither familiar with required drama techniques nor know about how to handle social interplay. Thereby the drama activity might neither have contributed to learning concerning the thematic content nor in dramatic form.

Throughout the thesis, I have discussed that the dominating emphasis on achievements of standardized knowledge requirements within the Swedish school tends to lead to a unilateral focus on outcomes. The educational process is delimited to being the most efficient and fastest way to achieve this. Thereby, the process is given an instrumental value based on its capacity to promote a predefined outcome (Biesta, 2011). This produces a linear process directed towards the outcomes. What is going on in the process is given significance only if it benefits these outcomes (Ball & Olmedo, 2013). This closes down possibilities to, for example explore different alternatives of how to approach a phenomenon, to create an understanding of complex connections or ethical issues, or to engage in the unexpected that happens here-and-now (Carlgren 2014). As Deleuze (1968/2004, p. 205) formulates it, then the learning process tends to be just a "preparatory movement which must nevertheless disappear in the results". A focus on pre-defined outcomes promotes knowledge that can easily be measured, and to more knowledge about what is already known. Thus, when drama is offered as a recurrent part of school education, it challenges such educational practices by opening up for complex learning processes.

8.1.3 The actor AND the role

In the thesis, I have emphasized dramatic acting in role as one significant component in learning processes in drama. Here, I discuss the potential of learning processes when acting in role in a dramatic context is used in drama education. A point of departure is that the relation between the actual self and the dramatic role can be seen as a temporary assemblage of active components (see also the section 3.2.1 about assemblage). Following Deleuze and Guattari's (1972/2004) reasoning, a component is not a stable entity: all is made up by interrelations and thereby it depends on the condensation of relations that is focused in a particular occasion. While dramatic acting in role was considered as a component in the previous section, in the present it is considered as an assemblage. In this discussion, I use the conjunction AND as a theoretical tool, based on Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988, 1991/1994) idea about the logic of AND. It is described in section 3.2, and in the following, I provide a brief summary.

Deleuze and Guattari (1991/1994) use the conjunction "AND" to describe the interrelation between active parties. They describe the word AND as a tensor subtracting the active parties in their ongoing moving relation without mixing them up. AND is a non-hierarchical conjunction, and implies a shift focus from the surrounding concepts, to the relation and to the movements in-between.

To recap, in this thesis, it has been discussed that the participants create roles in the working processes to create dramatizations. Participants move in and out of role, and between different positions in relation to the role. This has been demonstrated by an example (section 6.1.5) where the youths working on a dramatization move in and out of role, and between submitting to the dramatic action and illustrating actions physically.

In the role work, the subject positions herself in different ways in relation to the role, to others in role and in the actual context. To take a role can also imply to displace oneself into the position of an imagined other. The positioning is simultaneously a physical and a symbolic doing. This can be described as the subject exploring different ways to position herself, and that different ways to relate to a role provide different experiences of potential becomings. Through dramatic acting in role, the subject can create an understanding about others' perspectives and conditions, and simultaneously learn about who she can be and become herself. The

subject is conscious of and reflects on herself, the taken role, and of co-actors in roles and as themselves, which is understood as an aesthetic doubling.

Herein, the conclusions drawn in my study converge with ideas about acting in role within drama education articulated by several drama researchers. Some examples are Bolton (1984, 1992), Courtney (1990), Østern and Heikkinen (2001), Rasmussen (2013b), Sæbø (2009), and Sternudd (2000).

However, through connecting this reasoning about acting in role in a dramatic context, with Deleuze and Guattari's (1980/1988, 1991/1994) idea about the logic of AND can shed new light on how to understand learning processes through acting in role within drama education. The dramatic role can be seen as a dynamic creation, composed by the actual dramatic context, the participant's perceptions about herself and others, earlier knowing about others' conditions and an imagination of potential ways of being and acting (virtualities). Thereby, the role is never fixed.

Acting in a role in a dramatic context is an assemblage composed of the embodied subject together with other components, out of which the present thesis has highlighted the dramatic role, affects, other participants in and outside a role, objects and the physical space.

The subject moves between the fictive and the actual context, and between different positions in relation to the role, and in relation to others in a dynamic continuum. Taking a nomadic approach, each positioning in relation to the created role can be seen as an exploration of a potential way of being. By doing this, the subject is affected and also affects others. It is an action involving sensory experiencing, affects and cognitive awareness. This opens for reflections about sensory experiencing, affects, memories, and about one's own and the others' concrete actions. It includes the experimentation of potential ways to act and think, and thus virtualities are temporarily actualized. Thereby, the acting in role opens up for learning processes.

The conjunction AND implies a focus on the relational moves in-between. As Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988) say, the relation between the subject and something in the world produces affects and percept that, in turn, creates thinking (concepts). Learning takes place as processes in-between that include affects, percepts and concepts. In other words, learning takes place in the AND. Thus,

learning through acting in role in a dramatic context takes place in the actual AND virtual, body AND physical space, interior experiencing AND exterior expression.

This approach to learning implies an emphasis on processes, and that all interrelated components have an importance for which learning is made possible. A conclusion drawn in this study is that what is characteristic for learning processes in acting in role in a dramatic context is the interrelation of the virtual AND actual, and when the individual experiments possible ways to act through the dramatic action, virtualities are temporary actualized. As Massumi (2002) says, the virtual can be felt in its effect on the actual. In drama, this takes place through acting in role and thereby produced sensory, emotional and cognitive experiencing.

8.1.3.1 Actualization of virtualities through dramatic acting

In the thesis, I have recurrently discussed that virtualities can be actualized through dramatic acting. Through the dramatic action, participants' perceptions, knowing and memories of earlier experiences are working together with the imagination of what potentially might be (the virtual) in the production of knowledge. In the thesis, I have argued that this is central for how learning takes place in drama and therefore I make here some concluding remarks about this.

As I discussed in section 3.2, the actual is what we can concretely perceive and know about while the virtual is about what potentially can be. The virtual is not contrary to reality, "it possesses a full reality by itself" (Deleuze, 1968/2004, p. 263). When induced through action, the virtual can be felt in its effect in the actual, a potentiality is created (Massumi, 2002). In drama, potentiality is created through the bodily doing in the dramatic action. The action can evoke memories of similar situations and emotions, which together with sensory and affective experiencing here-and-now, contribute to creation of new understanding. Learning takes place through the exploration of potential ways to act and become, both as the individual herself and collectively. Thereby, embodied learning is made possible about life conditions in different times and places beyond the space-time and life conditions the individual actually has experienced. It also opens up for experimenting and examining diverse alternatives of how to live together.

Thus, using a post-constructionist lens, drama can be described as follows: In drama pedagogical activities, imagination and artistic symbols are used when people together create potentialities through dramatic actions “as if”.

8.1.4 Connections of politics on micro-and macro-level

Throughout this thesis, I have discussed how prevailing national school policy and drama approaches impact on local drama educational practices. I have also discussed what is actually realized within local practices. A point of departure is that educational practices on macro- and micro-levels are interconnected. This is based on Deleuze and Guattari’s (1980/1988) and Foucault’s (1976/1990) ideas that micro- and macro-levels of politics are interrelated. Foucault’s reasoning has been highlighted in section 2.4 while Deleuze and Guattari’s idea has been discussed in section 3.2.1. In the following, I provide a brief summary of these ideas. Thereafter, I sum up and further discuss what drama can be within current compulsory schooling in Sweden, when locally offered as a regular, scheduled subject.

According to Foucault (1976/1990), power strategies on a macro-level are conditioning practices on a micro-level but they also depend on local strategies and conditions. On a field of power, diverse forces pull in different directions. Several discourses can be active simultaneously and it depends on where in the power play a discourse is, if it is an instrument or an obstacle for power (Foucault, 1975/2002).

Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1988) connect their reasoning about micro-politics and macro-politics with segmentarity. We are all segmented on micro- and macro-levels simultaneously. They argue that everything is political, and it is simultaneously a macro-politics and a micro-politics. However, it is the micro-politics that is crucial, “that makes it or breaks it” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988, p. 222). It is about micro-political activities that can be described as flows of belief and desires and which precede change. A multitude of such flows consolidates formations and decisions on a macro-level. This is relevant here because local drama educational practices can be seen as spaces of micro-political activities.

A recurrent theme in this thesis is that the prevailing neo-liberal influence and its connection with a traditional knowledge view within Swedish education, produces a

hierarchy between propositional knowledge, and value-related and general knowing. It also produces a hierarchy between theoretical school subjects, and aesthetic and practical subjects. Today, the dominating principles on national policy level are competition and free school choice, efficiency and the achievements of results. The current steering documents, the Education Act (SFS 2010:800) and curriculum for compulsory school (Lgr 11), produce an emphasis on the school subjects that are specified there as compulsory, and on the formulated knowledge requirements for these subjects. This in turn leads to organization of the concrete education often being governed by the knowledge requirements. Drama is mentioned in the general part of the curriculum as a way of knowing and form of expression, but the formulations about this are possible to interpret in different ways and are not connected with an obligation to use drama.

However, as I have mentioned, the Swedish Education Act allows a certain space for local school choices. Based on this together with the local decision makers' perception that drama provides a valuable way of knowing and form of expression, the three schools participating in this research study offer drama as a regular, scheduled subject at some point over time. Thereby, on a local level, the prevailing educational discourse and drama discourse encounter one another.

One conclusion I draw from the genealogical analysis presented in chapter 2 is that the prevailing drama discourse in Sweden is influenced by the reform pedagogical emphasis on experience-based and explorative learning, and on collaboration. It is also influenced by the socio cultural idea that the individual is an active agent in knowledge creation and that knowledge is contextually conditioned. This is connected with a view that drama is both an art form and method. The focus lies on creative processes of experiencing and exploration together. (See section 2.4.) Thus, this approach is based on epistemological and ontological assumptions that differ radically from the neo-liberal discourse that currently governs Swedish school education including, among other things, individualization and an emphasis on propositional knowledge and the achievements of results.

On a local level, education is put into practice through decisions and realization by the local schools and teachers (Ball, Maguire & Braun, 2012; Olsson, 2008). In chapters 5-7, I discussed what drama can be within local practices where it is offered as a regular, scheduled subject. In locally formulated descriptions, the organization

for and structure of drama education, and the pupils' expressed perceptions, different approaches to drama education appear. However, what actually takes place on a micro-political level, takes place as an encounter between the pupils and the staged education (Olsson, 2008).

All the three schools participating in this study highlight on their websites that drama education is offered, and the main argument is that drama supports learning in theoretical school subjects (see section 5.1.1). In the presentations on websites, is manifested an instrumental view of drama related to a neo-liberal logic where the educational process is subordinated to the outcomes. In the local sources (local syllabus, formulated plans and goals for drama education), a view on drama instead appears as having both intrinsic values as an art form, and being a resource for general knowing as well as knowledge acquisition in different subject matters. For this, drama is offered as a scheduled subject at some point over time, a drama specialist is employed as teacher and there is a special drama room. In section 5.2, I discussed the significance of an adapted educational space for drama education that opens for corporeal expressions and movements, and easily can be transformed depending on activity. In Swedish schools, it is unusual to provide such a space. The rationalization and reduction of the educational sector in Sweden (see section 2.3) have led to a densification of provided physical space in schools. Thus, to provide a drama room for recurring drama education indicates that the head of the schools participating in this study consider drama education important for the pupils.

There is also a formulated idea that drama should collaborate with other subjects. This manifests an idea that drama has both an instrumental value as a method and an intrinsic value as an art form. This integrated view converges with the prevailing drama discourse in Sweden (see for example Rasmusson, 2000, Sternudd, 2000). However, the collaboration between drama and other subjects is prevented by other requirements that govern the individual teacher's time for preparation for teaching, and by the involved teachers' scheduled teaching. These requirements are imposed by decision-makers on national and local levels, and are related to things considered important for efficient education and knowledge acquisition in mandatory school subjects. In this is manifested the dominating emphasis on subject-specific knowledge which is produced by the Swedish curriculum (see Wahlström & Sundberg, 2015). The drama teachers' formulations of the intentional object of learning indicate instead a view that in drama is interconnected education concerning

dramatic form, content with relation to other school subjects, general competences and value-related issues (section 5.1.1.2). The expressed ideas about drama also reflect an integrated view in that it is considered as both an art form and a method.

Thus, the local educational level can be seen as a field of tension where different discourses about drama are active (Foucault, 1976/1990). Because drama is not a compulsory subject in the national curriculum, it is not restricted by standardized knowledge requirements, and this produces a certain free space for the organization of drama education in accordance with the prevailing drama discourse.

Simultaneously, the results-orientation and the emphasis on compulsory school subjects govern what it is possible to do in educational practice. The teachers have to allocate time to other requirements preventing them from planning together and collaborating in their teaching of drama and other subjects. During periods with tests in compulsory school subjects, drama education may have to stand back in favor of support to the pupils for preparing for these tests (see section 5.1.4.2). In this way, the predominant results-oriented discourse governs what it is possible to prioritize on a local organizational level.

In the interviews with the youths, they articulate that there is a difference between drama and ordinary school education (see section 5.1.2). The character of drama as bodily expressing and experiencing through acting in role together with others contribute to drama being perceived as fun, and that this in turn promotes learning. Thus, the ways of knowing provided in drama education were considered as significant for engagement and learning. As I argued in section 5.1.2.1, engagement in an interconnected affective, sensory and cognitive experience through dramatic acting is experienced as fun. The engagement is created as an encounter between the individual's desire and the object to learn, and engagement is a prerequisite for learning (Dewey, 1916/2007; Deleuze & Guattari, 1972/2004; 1980/1988). In the interviews, drama was contrasted with ordinary school education, where they were obliged to sit still and work individually with given tasks. This was perceived as boring, which seems to be related to the pupils not actively were engaged in an experience through bodily expression and creating together. The articulation that this is boring may also be understood as a resistance to the perceived requirements to behave and perform in accordance with the traditionalist and results-oriented

education that currently tends to be predominant within Swedish compulsory schooling.

The youths' articulations about drama converges with the education staged in the drama classrooms. In chapters 6 and 7, I have discussed that the participants are intensively engaging in the collective process of creating and acting in dramatic actions. As I have discussed in the previous sections in this chapter, in concrete drama educational events, dramatic form, content and possibilities for the participants to explore potential ways to be and become, are interconnected and contribute to learning in and through drama. Learning takes place as collective experimenting and creation together, with no pre-given answers. This relates to the nomad philosophical idea that micro-politics as a practice implies, among other things, keeping the educational event open for the unexpected and not-yet-known (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988; Olsson, 2008; Semetsky, 2009).

Thus, in the drama classrooms an educational practice is staged that as such is not constrained by the dominating neo-liberal logic which, among other things, implies individualized education where the educational process is subordinated to the outcomes. What is at stake is the possibility to actually undertake drama education, and not to have to prioritize other things.

Taken together, what is going on in drama education is considered as multiple micro-political interventions (see Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1988) in that it opens up different ways of knowing and becoming. One conclusion drawn in this study is that through dramatic acting in role, the potentially possible can be temporarily actualized and explored, and in this sense, drama makes possible ways of learning and processes of becoming that complement otherwise realized school education. Drama education mobilizes a pedagogy that supports aesthetic, corporeal, collective and explorative processes. These processes require time and a physical space, and this is made possible by having drama as a scheduled subject and an adapted drama room. One contributing factor for these processes is that emphasis does not lie on predefined goals, where the process is subordinated to the results. Thus, one conclusion also drawn in this study is that drama as a recurrent part of compulsory school education makes a significant difference for the participating pupils in their schooling.

In this thesis, I have discussed that drama education opens up diverse ways of knowing, in one and a same educational event. On a micro-political level, this contributes towards equity in education and this will be further evolved in the following section.

8.1.4.1 Drama education and equity

That drama education open up for diverse ways of knowing, in one and a same educational event indicates that drama can be a significant contribution towards equity in compulsory schooling. As I mentioned in section 6.1.3, *equity* is defined as equal possibilities to participate in education and to learn, regardless of the individual's preconditions and preferences concerning learning strategies.

It seems that drama education provides possibilities for participants to use, and to shift between, different strategies. Thereby, there is space for the individual to use her capacities, previous understanding and perceptions in ways that are meaningful for both the common creation of a dramatic action and her own learning. I have discussed this in section 6.1.3, related to the fact that in the data it appears that the youths participate in the common work using and moving between different kind of roles (role function, social role and dramatic role). They interacted in different ways with objects and the space. I argue that the collective process to create a dramatic action open up for a variety of means for the individual to contribute to the common and to individual learning (Dewey, 1916/2007).

The definition above of *equity* refers to pupils' possibilities to participate and to learn, in a common educational process. It differs from how the term is used in the present educational debate in Sweden where the focus seems to lie on the achievement of results, and which has been discussed in the section 2.3 in this thesis. However, I argue that it is not enough to consider performance-based achievements for education to be equivalent for all pupils (see also Wahlström, 2014). To be educated also includes general knowing and processes of subjectivities. Equity in education includes possibilities for different ways of learning and becoming. As I discussed in section 6.1.3, a wide signification of equity includes pupils' equal possibilities to achieve knowledge and expand their capabilities regardless of their preconditions. One conclusion drawn in this study is that drama education can provide a complement to otherwise practiced school education, in that it opens up for

learning through different ways of knowing, and this in turn can contribute to equity in education.

8.2 Implications for drama education in Sweden

This research study has contributed to knowledge regarding what drama can be and how learning takes place in drama education and which components co-produce such learning processes. To consider which components are active and how they are interconnected has proven to be a tool for understanding of the complex processes of learning through drama. Thereby, it appears that, in a drama event, several processes are going on simultaneously. In this thesis, I have discussed that the artistic process to create and act in a dramatic action and the social process are interdependent processes. I have also discussed acting in role as a process where the individual moves between the actual and temporal actualization of virtualities. Throughout the thesis, the focus has mainly been on the components dramatic art form, content and processes of becoming. The focus on these makes visible the fact that they are all considered in the planning of drama education and are actively present in concrete practice, but they were not always made explicit for the participating pupils. In drama educational practice in Sweden, there is tendency to rely on the emotional and sensuous experiencing in dramatic acting, but to also not allocate time for reflection together about how the thematic content may be understood on a meta-level, and this might delimit possibilities for new and conscious understanding. In the thesis, I have argued that this may be related to the idea that drama is a wholly sensory and emotional experiencing that should not be broken apart theoretically. Based on Foucault's (1975/1991) reasoning, this might imply a risk that the division between theoretical and bodily, experiential knowing is re-produced. However, as Deleuze (1990/1995) argues, learning processes come about through desire and in the encounter between the subject and something in the world, and this produces affects and percepts (see section 3.3). This encounter makes us think and feel. Thus, thinking is not seen as apart from or preceding the action. In the creation of meaning, affect, percept and concept (thinking and expressing) work together. By emphasizing all the components in the formulation of the purpose for, planning and teaching drama, and then concerning both dramatic action and conscious reflection together,

these can be made explicit for the participants. This is to suggest a non-dichotomous approach to drama. In dramatic acting, the participants experience it as a whole, and by consciously highlight the active components in a drama event, different aspects of learning can be made explicit.

The participating schools in this study offer drama as regular, scheduled subject at some point over time. Above I argued that because drama is not a compulsory subject in the national curriculum, it is not restricted by standardized knowledge requirements, which produces a certain free space for organization of the drama education. Thus, it does not follow neo-liberal logic. Nor does it follow the dominating emphasis on subject-specific knowledge that is produced by the current Swedish curriculum. Drama instead opens for cross-disciplinary, aesthetic, collective and explorative processes where emphasis does not lie on predefined outcomes. In one and same event, drama provides possibilities for the participant to learn about the content of the dramatic action, general and value-related knowing, and learning about who she can be and become.

Allowing pupils to participate in different ways in one and same event makes possible an educational practice where the production of knowledge and processes of subjectivities are interconnected as practices. Thereby the school education's missions to foster and to provide possibilities for knowledge acquisition are throughout interconnected. I said in section 2.1 (p. 41) that the term fostering refers both to who the individual can be and become within the actual society, and the qualities desired she develop in order to contribute to the future society. I argue that fostering includes promoting a readiness to contribute to change conditions and create new alternatives of how to live together (see also Edling, 2012). In drama education, emphasis is both on the interrelations here-and-now and on the potential possible. Through dramatic actions, potential possible alternatives how to act and live together, can be created, explored and critically examined. Thereby, drama provides a significant contribution in school education. As I have discussed in this thesis, in the prevailing results-oriented discourse, there is a tendency to keep these two missions for education apart in educational practice, even though they are described as interwoven in the general part of the Swedish curriculum (see section 1.2.1 and chapter 2). This leads to the argument that drama as a scheduled subject

provides a complementary and challenging way of thinking about the organization for and practice of school subjects within compulsory schooling.

Additionally, the formulated intentions in the participating schools in this study, that there will be collaboration between drama and different school subjects, suggest that an interdisciplinary manner of organizing education can open different ways to learn a subject matter, and multi-faceted knowledge. Provided this is given time and space, education is not trapped in pre-formulated knowledge requirements, and that focus lies on an unconditioned exploration of different ways to understand a phenomenon, this could contribute to the creation of new knowledge. It could promote an education where learning and processes of becoming are given equal significance. However, I argue that vigilance is required if the prevailing emphasis on standardized knowledge requirements in other school subjects also do not permeate drama education. Collaboration between drama and other subjects must not adversely affect the possibilities for the exploration of potential ways to act and think.

My ambition is that this study can contribute to deepening understanding of the complex learning processes in drama, for all who are teaching drama. I also hope it will contribute to inspiration for local decision makers and schoolteachers to offer drama education regularly for their pupils.

8.3 Discussion about methodological approach and methods to produce data

In this section, I discuss the possibilities and limitations of the methodological approach and methods to produce data in the research study.

The research question about how processes of learning in drama can be understood through a post-constructionist perspective refers both to how such processes appear in the analysis of the data and to how this theoretical tool can contribute to capture processes. A research project always includes considerations concerning the theoretical approach, and in the present study, this has been done as a process that has implied a successive construction (see Lykke, 2009/2010). I have not started with

a choice of theoretical perspective and then used these as viewpoints, but instead I engaged in what can be understood as a nomadic research process. Thus, a nomadic approach has been used both as a tool for the analysis of learning processes in and through drama education, and to characterize my process as a researcher.

As a nomad, I have moved within a delimited and defined field, and this has been described in the thesis. Nomad philosophy has provided a conceptual tool to identify and analyze processes. By combining this with Dewey's educational philosophy, social interaction and communication have been illuminated. These theoretical approaches have been put in dialogue with central theoretical concepts in drama in the analysis of empirical data, and thereby different active components in drama education have been considered. A key point of departure in this study is that educational practices on macro- and micro-levels are interconnected, and therefore, a genealogical analysis of discursive formations of drama education in the compulsory school has been useful. Thus, by using several theoretical tools, different aspects have been illuminated.

Simultaneously, the use of different theoretical tools has led to several concepts being introduced in the thesis. Especially the use of a nomadic approach has led to this, because this implies a conceptual tool that has not been used before in drama research. This in turn implies that much text space is given to a description of how these are defined, and the thesis in this sense might be considered to be very theoretical. On the other hand, concepts have contributed to my understanding of what appears in the produced data. To use concepts that are new for me as researcher has been a help to catch sight of things that might have been taken for granted otherwise. In line with a nomad philosophical approach, I have not used fixed definitions of concepts that are imposed on the data. I have been thinking with the concepts together with data, and this has contributed to a displacement of my understanding of the concept during the research process.

Mapping has been used as a method, and this has implied a going between sites, and between theory and empirical data. Observations and interviews have complemented each other in the construction of data. By using drama as an integrated method to produce data in group interviews has proven to be useful. The possibilities for participants to choose to use drama to articulate perceptions has contributed to multiple aspects of a phenomenon being highlighted. For example, participants could

use drama to express a mood that was considered difficult to express verbally. The use of drama in interviews also contributed to participants being able to explore new perspectives on experiences in drama education. These different methods have together made it possible for me as a researcher to catch sight of and analyze processes, and identify what active components do.

The emphasis on learning processes and interconnections of components implies a relatively open focus in the observations. On the one hand, this has allowed me to be open to the recurrence of aspects as well as variations. On the other hand, to not use formulated categories as lenses during observations, might have contributed to there being components I have not seen or documented as data.

The focus on active components and what they do in different events and sites, implies that drama education in the participating classes has not been analyzed and presented as separate cases. Nor have the drama educational practices been analyzed as processes over time. It has not been possible for the reader to follow the processes in each class and this was on reflection a missed opportunity. To present the practices separately might have provided possibilities for understanding how different local conditions affect drama education. However, this was taken into consideration during the research process, and I decided to keep the present form of presentation for research ethical reasons. It is unusual in Sweden to offer Drama as a scheduled subject, and to present the schools separately might have implied a risk of identification of some of them.

Mapping as method of analysis has meant that both phenomenon that appear often in the data, and phenomenon that appear seldom or only once have been focused on. These have not been sorted into pre-formulated categories, because this might have implied that things that call for attention but do not fit in a category might have been missed (see MacLure, 2013a, 2013b). However, Greene (2013) criticizes such design as implying a loss of systematicity. She combines this critique with the argument that “systematicity can be communicated to others” (Greene, 2013, p. 753) because there is a shared understanding about methods. I have considered this and argue that independent on the method used, I as researcher always must carefully describe in the report what I have done and how I have done it. In this thesis, I have carefully described how data has been produced and analyzed.

To use instead, for example, an interpretative analysis, or use only a multimodal analysis as an analytic tool might have contributed more possibilities to compare the method and conclusions with other studies. These things have been considered during the research process. However, the chosen method has provided possibilities for encounters between the data, theory and me as researcher that have opened up for new understanding.

In the method chapter, I highlighted the critique of reflection as a research method formulated within the post-constructionist field (Barad, 2007; Lykke, 2009/2010). It is argued that the mirrored are considered as fixed entities and new patterns do not appear. I also considered Deleuze and Guattari's (1991/1994) reasoning that a critical stance might imply taking an oppositional position. There, I argued that reflexivity could be useful together with cartographic mapping. When reflecting on something, I always do it from a changed position. It involves being open for alternative ways of seeing and for the new things that might appear. Thereby, reflexivity is not about looking back on sameness but about seeing different things depending on my current position and where I direct my focus. During the research process, I have continuously connected this with reflections on my positions. Thereby, reflexivity has proven to be a useful thinking tool in this study.

In this research study, post-constructionism and theoretical drama concepts have been used together with empirical data, and this has proven to be a useful tool to approach processes of learning and becoming in drama education. A similar theoretical approach has not been used before within drama research. Thereby, this research study has contributed to the construction of a methodological tool to shed light on and further understand drama processes, and which can be applied to other drama practices.

8.4 Proposal for future research

Drama education in the participating school classes has not been analyzed in this study as processes over time. As a future investigation, I propose to follow a class over a longer time, having a focus on change over time and by using a similar

methodological approach as in the present study. By limiting the study to one single case, there might be space to also include a focus on what the teacher does in concrete educational practice. As I have mentioned, a delimitation in the present study is that an explicit focus does not lie on the drama teachers' way to teach.

An example of a research study with such a design is to investigate what drama can be within preschool education in Sweden when drama is regularly used. The only previous research about drama within Swedish preschool are Lindqvist's (1995) and Holmgren-Lind's (2007) studies mentioned in section 1.2.3.1. Some research studies about drama in early childhood education have been undertaken in Norway, and internationally there are also some. Within preschool practices in Sweden, drama tends not to be prioritized. This has been confirmed by professional preschool teachers with whom I have been in contact. However, at some Swedish preschools, drama pedagogues are now employed as teachers. One reason may be the current shortage of preschool teachers and the need for staff. Anyhow, this is interesting considering that drama is generally not prioritized. What can drama be in preschools where drama pedagogues are employed? How are the drama pedagogue and the preschool teacher collaborating?

Today, there is a debate within the educational field about the requirements for more teaching within preschool education. One argument has been formulated by for example the Swedish Schools Inspectorate (2018) that this education is an important first step for lifelong learning. The importance of this for the children to perform well in their future school education is also emphasized. Thus, it seems that neo-liberal ideas intend to seep into this field as well. However, there are other voices which highlight the danger of "schoolification" (in Swedish: *skolifiering*) of preschool education. (The term signifies that the preschool becomes increasingly similar to compulsory school.) Together with the critique of such schoolification are highlighted qualities specific for education for the youngest children which are important to focus on and develop.

This evokes questions concerning what drama is and potentially can be within Swedish's preschool.

References

- Adams, J. & Owens, A. (2016). *Creativity and Democracy in Education: Practices and politics of learning through the arts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ahlstrand, P. (2014). *Att kunna lyssna med kroppen: En studie av gestaltande förmåga inom gymnasieskolans estetiska program, inriktning teater*. [To listen with your body: A study examining the capability to act within theatre education at upper secondary school level.] Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm University.
- Alvesson, M. & Sköldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Aronsson, K. (2012). Barnperspektiv: att avläsa barns utsatthet. [Child perspective: to read the children's vulnerability.] *Locus*, 1-2/12, 100-117.
- Aronsson, K. & Hundeide, K. (2002). Relational Rationality and Children's Interview Responses. *Human Development*, 45, 174-186.
- Åsberg, C. (2012). Läs-kunnighet bortom humanioras bekvämlighetszoner. [Literacy beyond the humanities' comfort zones.] In Åsberg, C., Hultman, M. & Lee, F. (Eds.) *Posthumanistiska nyckeltexter* (pp. 7-21). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Åsberg, C., Hultman, M. & Lee, F. (2012). Möt den posthumanistiska utmaningen. [Meet the post humanist challenge.] In Åsberg, C., Hultman, M. & Lee, F. (Eds.) *Posthumanistiska nyckeltexter* (pp. 29-45). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Askland, L. & Sataoen, S. O. (2014). *Utvecklingspsykologiska perspektiv på barns uppväxt*. [Developmental psychological perspectives on children's growth.] (2nd ed.) Stockholm: Liber.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. (C. Emerson, Ed. and Trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota press.
- Baldwin, P. (2012). *With Drama in Mind: Real Learning in Imagined Worlds*. (2nd ed.) London and New York: Continuum.
- Ball, S. J. (2010). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215-228.
- Ball, S. J. (2013). *The education debate*. (2nd ed.) Bristol: The policy Press.
- Ball, S. J. (2016). Neoliberal education? Confronting the slouching beast. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(8), 1046-1059.
- Ball, S. J., Maguire, M. & Braun, A. (2012). *How Schools do Policy: Policy enactment in secondary schools*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ball, S. J. & Olmedo, A. (2013). Care of the self, resistance and subjectivity under neoliberal governmentalities. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(1), 85-96.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Berthoz, A. (2006). *Emotion and Reason: The cognitive neuroscience of decision making* (G. Weiss, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 2003)
- Bhabha, H. (2005). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge Classics. (Original work published 1994)
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2006). *Beyond learning: democratic education for a human future*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2011). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2014). *The Beautiful Risk of Education*. Boulder and London:

- Paradigm Publishers.
- Boal, A. (2000). *Theatre of the oppressed*. (C. A. McBride, M-O Lear McBride and E. Fryer, Trans.). London: Pluto Press. (Original work published 1974)
- Bolton, G. (1984). *Drama as Education: an argument for placing drama at the centre of the curriculum*. Essex: Longman.
- Bolton, G. (1992). *New Perspectives on Classroom Drama*. Hemel Hempsted: Simon & Schuster.
- Bolton, G. (1998). *Acting in Classroom Drama: A Critical Analysis*. Portland, Maine: Calendar Islands Publishers.
- Bolton, G. (2007). A History of Drama Education: A Search for Substance. In Bresler, L. (Ed.) *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education*, (pp. 45-62). Netherlands: Springer.
- Börjesson, M. (2016). *Från likvärdighet till marknad: En studie av offentligt och privat inflytande över skolans styrning i svensk utbildningspolitik 1969-1999*. [From Equity to Markets: A Study of Public and Private Influence on School Governance in Swedish Education Policy 1969-1999.] Örebro Studies in Education 52. Doctoral dissertation, Örebro University.
- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2002). *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Braidotti, R. (2006). *Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Braidotti, R. (2010). Nomadism: against methodological nationalism. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(3), 408-418.
- Braidotti, R. (2011). *Nomadic Theory: The portable Rosi Braidotti*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bresler, L. (2006). Toward Connectedness: Aesthetically Based Research and its Ethical Implications. *Studies in Art Education: A journal of Issues and Research in Art Education*, 48(1), 52-69.
- Bresler, L. (2011). Arts-based Research and Drama Education. In Schonmann, S. (Ed.) *Key Concepts in Theatre/Drama Education* (pp. 321-326). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- British Educational Research Association (BERA). (2011). *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*.
<https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/resources-for-researchers>
- Brockett, O. G. (1982). *History of the Theatre* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Buchanan, I. (2008). Power, Theory and Praxis. In Buchanan, I. & Thoburn, N. (Eds.) *Deleuze and Politics* (p. 12-34). Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.
- Bundy, P. (2003). Aesthetic Engagement in the Drama Process. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of applied Theatre and Performance*, 8(2), 171-181.
- Bundy, P., Ewing, R. & Fleming, J. (2013). Drama and the Audience: Transformative Encounters in TheatreSpace. In Anderson, M. & Dunn, J. (Eds.). *How Drama Activates Learning: Contemporary Research and Practice* (pp. 145-158). London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social Constructionism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Byréus, K. (2010). *Du har huvudrollen i ditt liv: Om forumspel som pedagogisk metod för frigörelse och förändring*. [You play the main role in your life: Forum Play as an educational method for emancipation and change.] Stockholm: Liber. (Original work published 1990)

- Carlgren, I. (2010a). *Liberal Education After the Practice Turn – From Knowledge Forms to Epistemic Cultures (Ways of Knowing)*. Contribution to the symposium “Curriculum Theory: Dead man walking? An international Dialogue.”, AERA, Denver, April 30 – May 4, 2010.
- Carlgren, I. (2010b). Pedagogisk interaktion. [Educational interaction.] In Melander, H. & Sahlström, F. (Eds.). *Lärande i interaktion* (pp. 195-215). Stockholm: Liber.
- Carlgren, I. (2011). Direkt och indirekt lärande i skolan. [Direct and indirect learning in school.] In Jensen, M. (Ed.) *Lärandets grunder: teorier och perspektiv*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Carlgren, I. (2012). Kunskap för bildning? [Knowledge for bildung?] In Englund, T., Forsberg, E. & Sundberg, D. (Eds.). *Vad räknas som kunskap?* (pp. 118-139). Stockholm: Liber.
- Carlgren, I. (2014). Hur ska vi återta skolan som samhällsbyggande institution och skapa en hållbar skolutveckling? [How can we regain the school as a community building institution and create a sustainable school development?] *Skola och Samhälle*.
www.skolaochsamhalle.se. (Downloaded: 12 June 2014)
- Carlgren, I., Klette, K., Mýrdal, S., Schnack, K. & Simola, H. (2006). Changes in Nordic Teaching Practices: From individualised teaching to the teaching of individuals. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 301-326.
- Chan, Y-I. P. (2009). In their own words: how do students relate drama pedagogy to their learning in curriculum subjects? *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 14(2), 191-209.
- Clark, A. (1999). An embodied cognitive science? *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 3(9), 345-351.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in Education*. (6th ed.) London and New York: Routledge.
- Cole, D. R. (2011). *Educational Life-Forms: Deleuzian Teaching and Learning Practice*. Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Colebrook, C. (2002). *Understanding Deleuze*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.
- Courtney, R. (1990). *Drama and Intelligence: A Cognitive Theory*. Montreal & Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Courtney, R. (1995). *Drama and Feeling: An Aesthetic Theory*. Montreal & Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Damasio, A. R. (1994). *Descartes's error: Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain*. New York: Putnam.
- Data Protection Act. (1998).
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/29/contents>
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. (R. Hurley. Trans.). San Francisco: City Light Books. (Original work published 1970)
- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations 1972-1990* (M. Joughin. Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1990)
- Deleuze, G. (2002). The Actual and the Virtual (E. Ross Albert, Trans.). In Deleuze, G. & Parnet, C. *Dialogues II*. London and New York: Continuum (112-115). (Original work published 1977)
- Deleuze, G. (2004). *Difference and Repetition* (P. Patton, Trans.). London and New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1968)
- Deleuze, G. (2004). *The logic of sense* (M. Lester with C. Strivale, Trans.). London and New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1969)

- Deleuze, G. (2005). *Pure Immanence: Essays of A Life* (A. Boyman. Trans.). New York: Zone Books. (Original work published 1995)
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1988). *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). London: Athlone Press. (Original work published 1980)
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1994). *What Is Philosophy?* (H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1991)
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2004). *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. (R. Hurley, M. Seem, and H. R. Lane. Trans.). London and New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1972)
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2016). *Anti-Oedipus: kapitalism och schizofreni*. (G. Holmbäck, Trans.). Hägersten: TankeKraft Förlag. (Original work published 1972)
- Dewey, J. (1900). *The School and Society*. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we Think: A Restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Dewey, J. (1958). *Experience and Nature*. New York: Dover Publications. (Original work published 1929)
- Dewey, J. (1991). *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. In: Boydston, A. (Ed.) *John Dewey, The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 12*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1938)
- Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and Education*. New York: Simon & Shuster. (Original work published 1938).
- Dewey, J. (2005). *Art as Experience*. New York: A Periee Book. (Original work published 1934)
- Dewey, J. (2007). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. NuVision Publications. (Original work published 1916)
- DRACON International (2005). *Bridging the fields of drama and conflict management. Empowering students to handle conflicts through school-based programmes*. Malmö: Malmö University.
<http://dspace.mah.se/bitstream/2043/5975/1/drac06nov.pdf> (Downloaded: 16 February 2014)
- Duffy, P. (2012). Problem Finders in Problem Spaces: A Review of Cognitive Research for Drama in Education. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 26(2), 120-132.
- Duffy, P. (2015). Brain, Mind and Drama: Embodied Cognition, Encoding and Drama. In Schonmann, S. (Ed.). *International Yearbook for Research in Arts Education: The Wisdom of the Many – Key Issues in Arts Education* (vol. 3), (pp. 241-245). Münster: Waxmann.
- Edling, S. (2012). *Att vilja andra väl är inte alltid smärtfritt: Att motverka kränkningar och diskriminering i förskola och skola*. [Wanting others well is not always painless: To counteract abuses and discrimination in preschool and school.] Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Edmiston, B. (2000). Drama as Ethical Education. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 5(1), 63-84.
- Elsner, C. (2000). *Så tänker lärare i estetiska ämnen*. [How aesthetic subjects teachers think.] Häften för didaktiska studier, Lärarhögskolan i Stockholm. Stockholm: HLS Förlag.
- Eriksson, S. (2009). *Distancing at close range: Investigating the significance of*

- distancing in drama education*. Doctoral dissertation, Vaasa: Åbo Academy University.
- Fangen, K. (2005). *Deltagande observation*. [Participating observation.] (H. Nordli, Trans.). Stockholm: Liber. (Original work published 2004)
- Fejes, A. (2006). *Constructing the adult learner – a governmentality analysis*. Doctoral dissertation. Linköping University.
- Fejes, A. (2008). To be one's own confessor: educational guidance and governmentality. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(6), 653-664.
- Finlay, L. (2002). Negotiating the swamp: the opportunity and challenge of reflexivity in research practice. *Qualitative Research*, 2(2), 209-230.
- Finlay, L. (2008). Reflecting on 'Reflective practice'. PBPL paper 52, *Practice – based Professional Learning centre*.
www.open.ac.uk/pbpl (Downloaded: 11 March 2018)
- Fischer-Lichte, E. (2008). *The Transformative Power of Performance: A new aesthetics* (S. I. Jain, Trans.). London and New York: Routledge. (Original work published 2004)
- Fleming, M. (1999). An Integrated Approach to Teaching Drama for Aesthetic Learning. *NJ (N.A.D.I.E. journal (National Association for Drama in Education (Australia))*, 23(3), 91-99.
- Fleming, M. (2001). *Teaching Drama in Primary and Secondary Schools: An Integrated Approach*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Fleming, M. (2006). Justifying the Arts: Drama and Intercultural Education. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 40(1), 54-64.
- Fleming, M. (2012). *The arts in Education: An introduction to aesthetics, theory and pedagogy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Fontana, A. & Frey, J. H. (2008). The Interview. From Neutral Stance to Political Involvement. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (ed.) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* (pp. 115-159). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge: and the discourse on language*. (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1969)
- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and Power. In Gordon, C. (Ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* (pp. 109-133). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of Discourse: Inaugural Lecture at the Collège de France, given 2 December 1970. In Young, R. (Ed.). *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader* (p. 48-78). Boston, London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1971)
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. In Dryfus, H. & Rabinow, P. (Eds.). *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the Self. In Luther, H. M., Gutman, H. & Hutton, P. H. (Eds.). *Technologies of the Self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1976)
- Foucault, M. (1991). Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Hamondsworth: Penguin. (Original work published 1975)
- Foucault, M. (1991). Questions of Method. In Burchell, G., Gordon, C. & Miller, P. (Eds.). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, (pp. 73-86). Chicago:

- The University of Chicago Press.
- Franks, A. (1996). Drama Education, the Body and Representation (or, the mystery of the missing bodies). *Research in Drama Education*, 1(1), 105-119.
- Franks, A. (2015a). How Environment Affects Learning: School Teachers Engaging with Theatre-based Pedagogies. In Davis, S., Ferholt, B., Grainger Clemens, H., Jansson, S-M. & Majanovic-Shane, A. (Eds.) *Dramatic Interactions in Education: Vygotskian and Sociocultural Approaches to Drama, Education and Research* (pp. 229-244). London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- Franks, A. (2015b). What have we done with the bodies? Bodyliness in drama education research. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 20(3), 312-315.
- Fredriksson, K. (2013). *Drama som pedagogisk möjlighet: En intervjustudie med lärare i grundskolan*. [Drama as educational possibility: An interview study with teachers in compulsory school.] Thesis for licentiate degree. Linköping University.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: continuum. (Original work published 1970)
- Gallacher, L-A. & Gallagher, M. (2008). Methodological immaturity in childhood research? Thinking through 'participatory methods'. *Childhood*, 15(4), 499-516.
- Gallagher, K. (2000). *Drama Education in the Lives of Girls: Imagining Possibilities*. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press.
- Gallagher, K. (2007). Conceptions of Creativity in Drama Education. In Bresler, L. (Ed.) *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education*, (pp. 1229-1239). Netherlands: Springer.
- Gallagher, K. (2008). The art of methodology: a collaborative science. In Gallagher, K. (Ed.) *The Methodological Dilemma. Creative, critical and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 67-81). London & New York: Routledge.
- Gallagher, K. (2011). Theatre as Methodology or What Experimentation Affords us. In Schonmann, S. (ed.) *Key Concepts in Theatre/Drama Education* (pp. 327-331). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Gallagher, K. (2015). Foreword. In Perry, M. & Medina, C. L. (Eds.) *Methodologies of Embodiment: Inscribing Bodies in Qualitative Research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gallagher, K. & Kim, I. (2008). Moving towards postcolonial, digital methods in qualitative research: Contexts, cameras and relationships. In Gallagher, K. (Ed.) *The Methodological Dilemma: Creative, critical and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 103-120). London and New York: Routledge.
- Garratt, D., Piper, H. & Taylor, B. (2013). 'Safeguarding' sport coaching: Foucault, genealogy and critique. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(5), 615-629.
- Genesko, G. (2000). The Life and Work of Félix Guattari. In Guattari, F. *The Three Ecologies* (pp. 106-159). London and New Brunswick, NJ: The Athlone Press.
- Gordon, T., Holland, J. & Lahelma, E. (2000). *Making Spaces: Citizenship and Difference in Schools*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan Press.
- GOV. UK. (2016). *National curriculum in England: English programmes of study*. GOV. UK, Department of Education.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-english-programmes-of-study/national-curriculum-in-england-english-programmes-of-study> (Downloaded: 12 October 2017)
- Greene, J. C. (2013). On rhizomes, lines of flight, mangles, and other assemblages. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 749-758.

- Greene, S. & Hill, M. (2005). Researching children's experience: methods and methodological issues. In Green, S. & Hogan, D. (Eds.) *Researching Children's Experience: Approaches and Methods* (pp. 1-21). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Guattari, F. (1995). *Chaosmosis: An ethico-aesthetic paradigm*. (P. Bains and J. Pefanis. Trans.) Sydney: Power Publications. (Original work published 1992)
- Gubbins, C. & MacCurtain, S. (2008). Understanding the Dynamics of Collective Learning: The Role of Trust and Social Capital. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10(4), 578-599.
- Gunnarsson, K. (2015). *Med en önskan om kontroll: Figurationer av hälsa i skolors hälsofrämjande arbete*. [With a desire for control: Figurations of health in school's health promotion.] Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm University.
- Gustavsson, B. (2000). *Kunskapsfilosofi. Tre kunskapsformer i historisk belysning*. [Knowledge philosophy. Three forms of knowledge in a historical perspective.] Smedjebacken: Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Gustavsson, B. (2002). *Vad är kunskap? En diskussion om praktisk och teoretisk kunskap*. [What is knowledge? A discussion about practical and theoretical knowledge.] Stockholm: Myndigheten för skolutveckling.
- Haagenen, C. (2014). *Lived experience and devised theatre practice: a study of Australian and Norwegian theatre students' devised theatrical practice*. Doctoral dissertation. Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) and Queensland University of Technology (QUT).
- Hägglund, K. (2001). *Ester Boman, Tyringe Helpension och teatern: drama på en reformpedagogisk flickskola 1909-1936*. [Ester Boman and Theatre at the Tyringe Helpension; Drama at a Progressive Education Girls' School 1909-1936.] Doctoral dissertation, Lärarhögskolan i Stockholm. Stockholm: HLS Förlag.
- Hägglund, K. (2008). Att forska om dramapedagogikens historia i Sverige. [Researching about the history of drama pedagogy in Sweden.] In Lindberg, V. & Borg, K. (Eds.) *Kunskapande, kommunikation och bedömning i gestaltande utbildning*, (pp. 58-64). Stockholm: Stockholms universitets förlag.
- Hagnell, V. (1983). *Barnteater – myter och meningar*. [Children's theatre – Myths and meanings.] Malmö: Liber.
- Halldén, G. (2003). Barnperspektiv som ideologiskt eller metodologiskt begrepp. [Child's perspective as ideological or methodological concept.] *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 8(1-2), 12-23.
- Haptik. (1992). In *Nationalencyklopedin*. Höganäs: Bokförlaget Bra Böcker.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599.
- Haraway, D. (2004). *The Haraway Reader*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Hartman, S. (2005). *Det pedagogiska kulturarvet: Traditioner och idéer i svensk undervisningshistoria*. [The pedagogical cultural heritage: Traditions and ideas in Swedish education history.] Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.
- Helander, K. (2014). *Barndramatik och barndomsdiskurser*. [Child drama and childhood discourses.] (2nd ed.) Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Henry, M. (2000). Drama=s Ways of Learning. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 5(1), pp. 45-62.
- Holmgren-Lind, L. (2007). *Pedagogiskt drama – i skärningspunkten mellan teaterkonst och estetisk praktik*. [Educational drama – at the intersection of theatre art and aesthetic practice.] Thesis for licentiate degree. Linköping

- University.
- Hornbrook, D. (1998). *Education and Dramatic Art*. (2nd ed.) London and New York: Routledge.
- HSFR. (1996). *Etik: God praxis vid forskning med video*. [Ethics: Good practice in research with video.] Humanistisk-Samhällsvetenskapliga Forskningsrådets Etikkommitté, Uppsala.
<http://www.du.se/PageFiles/5860/etikHSFR.pdf> (Downloaded: 8 April 2011)
- Hunter, M. A. (2008). Cultivating the art of safe space. *Research in Drama Education*, 13(1), 5-21.
- Illeris, K. (2015). *Lärande [Learning]*. (3rd ed.) (S. Andersson, Trans.). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Immordino-Yang, M. H. & Damasio, A. (2015). We Feel, Therefore We Learn: The Relevance of Affective and Social Neuroscience to Education. In Immordino-Yang, M. H. (Ed.) *Emotions, Learning and the Brain: Exploring the Educational Implications of Affective Neuroscience*, (pp. 27-42). New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Innes, M., Moss, T. & Smigiel, H. (2001). What Do the Children Say? The Importance of Student Voice. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 6(2), 207-221.
- Jacquet, E. (2011). *Att ta avstamp i gestaltande: Pedagogiskt drama som resurs för skrivande*. [Using drama as a starting point: Educational drama as a resource for writing.] Thesis for licentiate degree. Stockholm University.
- Jewitt, C. (2014). An introduction to multimodality. In Jewitt, C. (Ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*, (pp. 14-27). London and New York: Routledge.
- Johansson, L. (2015). *Tillblivelsens pedagogik: Om att utmana det förgivettagna. En postkvalitativ studie av det ännu-icke-seddans pedagogiska möjligheter*. [A Pedagogy of Becoming: Challenging the obvious. A post-qualitative approach to the pedagogical opportunities of the not-yet-seen.] Doctoral dissertation, Lund's University.
- Johansson, L. (2016). Post-qualitative line of flight and the confabulative conversation: a methodological ethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies*, 29(4), 445-466.
- Johnstone, K. (1979). *Impro: Improvisation and the Theatre*. London, New Delhi, New York and Sidney: Bloomsbury.
- Key, E. (1900/1995). *Barnets århundrade*. [The Century of the Child.] Stockholm: ABF förbundet/ Bildningsförlaget.
- Kirkeby, I. M. (2006). *Skolen finder sted*. [Creating school buildings.]. Hørsholm: Statens Byggeforskningsinstitut.
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kullberg, B. (2014). *Etnografi i klassrummet*. (3rd ed.) [Ethnography in the classroom.] Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Kvale, S. & Brinkman, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publishing.
- Larsson, J. (2013). *Disciplin och motstånd: Pedagogisk-filosofiska perspektiv på samtida svensk skoldisciplin*. [Discipline and resistance: Pedagogical-philosophical perspectives on contemporary Swedish school discipline.] Doctoral dissertation, Karlstad University studies 2013:36. Karlstad University.
- Leavy, P. (2015). *Method Meets Arts: art-Based Research Practice* (2nd ed.). New

- York and London: the Guilford Press.
- Leijnse, E. (2011, April 4). "Min uppväxt har absolut präglat min syn på skolan". *Sydsvenskan*, 2011, 4 april.
- Lekare. (1993). In *Nationalencyklopedin*. Höganäs: Bokförlaget Bra Böcker.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010). *Going Beyond the Theory/Practice Divide in Early Childhood Education: Introducing an intra-active pedagogy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lepp, M. (1998). *Pedagogiskt drama med fokus på personlig utveckling och yrkesmässig växt: En studie inom sjuksköterske- och vårdlärarutbildning*. [Drama with focus on personal development and professional growth: A study carried out in nurse training and nurse tutor education.] Doctoral dissertation, Lund's University. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Lindqvist, G. (1995). *The aesthetics of play: a didactic study of play and culture in preschools*. Doctoral dissertation, Uppsala studies in education, Uppsala University.
- Lindvåg, A. (1988). *Elsa Olenius och Vår teater*. [Elsa Olenius and Vår teater.] Doctoral dissertation, Lund University. Stockholm: Raben & Sjögren.
- Lipschütz, D. (1976). *Dynamisk pedagogik: Synpunkter på skapande verksamhet samt samspel och samarbete i grupp*. [Dynamic pedagogy: Comments on creative activity, and interaction and cooperation in groups.] Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Lofors-Nyblom, L. (2009). *Elevskap och elevskapande – om formandet av skolans elever*. [Pupil ship and the Construction of Pupils: How school pupils are formed.] Doctoral dissertation, Umeå University.
- Löf, C. (2011). *Med livet på schemat: Om skolämnet livskunskap och den riskfyllda barndomen*. [With life on the schedule: About the school subject Life Competence Education and the risky childhood.] Doctoral dissertation, Malmö University.
- Lykke, N. (2010). *Feminist Studies: A Guide to Intersectional Theory, Methodology and Writing*. (P. Larsson, Trans.). London and New York: Routledge. (Original work published 2009)
- Lykke, N. (2010). The timeliness of Post-Constructionism. *NORA – Nordic journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 18(2), 131-136.
- Lgr 62. *Läroplan för grundskolan 1962*. Stockholm: Kungl. Skolöverstyrelsen.
- Lgr 80. *Läroplan för grundskolan 1980*. Skolöverstyrelsen. Stockholm: Liber Utbildningsförlag.
- Lpo 94. *Läroplanen för det obligatoriska skolväsendet, och de frivilliga skolformerna*. Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet. Svensk facklitteratur.
- Lgr11/17. *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet. Reviderad 2017*. Skolverket. Stockholm: Wolters Kluwer.
<https://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=3813> (Downloaded: 29 October 2017)
- MacLure, M. (2011). Qualitative Inquiry: where are the Ruins? *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(10), 997-1005.
- MacLure, M. (2013a). Classification or Wonder? Coding as an Analytic practice in Qualitative Research. In Coleman, R. & Ringrose, J. (Eds.) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 164-183). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- MacLure, M. (2013b). Researching without representation? Language and Materiality in post-qualitative methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 658-667.

- Magnér, B. & Magnér, H. (1976). *Medveten människa: En metod att utforska förhållanden mellan individ och samhälle*. [Conscious human: A method to explore the relationships between the individual and society.] Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Maguire, M., Braun, A. & Ball, S. J. (2015). 'Where you stand depends on where you sit': the social construction of policy enactments in the (English) secondary school. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36(4), 485-499.
- Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Mjaaland Heggstad, K., Eriksson, S. A. & Rasmussen, B. (Eds.) (2013). Redaktørenes introduksjon. [Editors' introduction.] In Mjaaland Heggstad, K., Eriksson, S. A. & Rasmussen, B. (Eds.) *Teater som dannings*, pp. 11-20. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Morawski, J. (2010). *Mellan frihet och kontroll: Om läroplanskonstruktioner i svensk skola*. [Between Freedom and Control: Constructions of Curricula in Swedish schools.] Doctoral dissertation, Örebro University. Örebro.
- Myndigheten för kulturanalys. (2013). *Skapande skola: en första utvärdering*. [Creative School grant: A first evaluation.] Rapport 2013:4. Stockholm: Myndigheten för kulturanalys.
- Neelands, J. (2006). Re-imagining the Reflective Practitioner: towards a philosophy of critical praxis. In: Ackroyd, J. (Ed.) *Research Methodologies for Drama Education*, (pp. 15-39). Stoke on Trent, UK and Sterling, USA: Trentham Books.
- Neelands, J. (2009). Acting together: ensemble as a democratic process in art and life. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 14(2), 173-189.
- Nicholson, H. (2002). The Politics of Trust: Drama education and the ethic of care. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 7(1), 81-91.
- Oddey, A. (1996). *Devising Theatre: A practical and theoretical handbook*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Öfverström, C. (2006). *Upplevelse, inlevelse och reflektion – drama som aktiv metod i lärandet: En teoretisk analys och empirisk undersökning av hur lärare tänker när de använder drama som metod*. [Experience, empathy and reflection – drama as active method for learning: A theoretical analysis and an empirical study about how teachers think when they use drama as a method.] Thesis for licentiate degree, Linköping University.
- Øksnes, M. (2006). Det siste ordet er ikke sagt! [The last word is not said!] In: Steinholt, K. & Sommerro, H. (Eds.). *Improvisasjon: Konsten å sette seg selv på spill*, (pp. 309-325). Norge: N. W. Damm & Søn.
- Øksnes, M. (2010). *Lekens flertydighet: Om barns lek i en institutionaliserad barndom*. [The ambiguity of play: About children's play in an institutionalized childhood.] Stockholm: Liber.
- Olsson, E-K. (2006). *Att vara någon annan: Teater som estetisk läroprocess vid tre 6-9-skolor*. [Being someone else: Theater as aesthetic learning process at three 6-9 schools.] Thesis for licentiate degree, Växjö University.
- Olsson, L. M. (2008). *Movement and Experimentation in Young Children's Learning: Deleuze and Guattari in Early Childhood Education*. Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm University.
- Osmond, C. R. (2007). Drama Education and the Body: "I am, therefore I think". In

- Bresler, L. (Ed.) *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education*, (pp. 1109-1118). Netherlands: Springer.
- Österlind, E. (1998). *Disciplining via frihet: Elevers planering av sitt eget arbete*. [Disciplining via Freedom: Independent work and student planning.] Doctoral dissertation, Uppsala University. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Österlind, E. (2009). Dramaforskning i Sverige – två steg framåt och ett tillbaka. [Drama research in Sweden – two steps forward and one back.] *Drama*, 3/2009, 16-23.
- Österlind, E. (2011a). Forum Play: A Swedish Mixture for Consciousness and Change. In Schonmann, S. (Ed.). *Key Concepts in Theatre/ Drama Education*, (pp. 247-251). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Österlind, E. (2011b). 'What Theatre is All About': Students' Experiences of the Swedish Theatre Arts Program. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 25(1), 75–86.
- Österlind, E. & Hallgren, E. (2014). Heathcote in Sweden – just passing by? *Drama Research: international journal of drama in education*, 5(1).
- Østern, A-L. (2011). Transformation. In Schonmann, S. (Ed.) *Key Concepts in Theatre/Drama Education* (pp. 59-63). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Østern, A. & Heikkinen, H. (2001). The Aesthetic Doubling: A Central Concept for the Theory of Drama Education? In: Rasmussen, B., Kjølner, T., Rasmusson, V. & Heikkinen, H. (Eds.) *Nordic Voices: In Drama, Theatre and Education*, (pp.110-123). Bergen: Idea Publications.
- O'Toole, J. (1992). *The Process of Drama: Negotiating art and meaning*. London and New York: Routledge.
- O'Toole, J. & Stinson, M. (2013). Drama, Speaking and Listening: The Treasure of Oracy. In Andersson, M. & Dunn, J. (Eds.) *How Drama Activates Learning: Contemporary Research and Practice* (pp. 159-177). London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- Piaget, J. (1982). *The essential Piaget*. (Gruber, H. E. & Vonèche, J. J. Eds.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pink, S. (2009). *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Pink, S. (2011). Multimodality, multisensoriality and ethnographic knowing: social semiotics and the phenomenology of perception. *Qualitative Research*, 11(3), 261-276).
- Podlozny, A. (2000). Strengthening verbal skills through the use of classroom drama: A clear link. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3-4), 239-275.
- Pusztai, I. (2000). *Stanislavskij-variationer – Skådespelarövningar som didaktiska instrument i pedagogiskt drama*. [Stanislavski-variations. Exercises for actor training employed as didactical instruments in drama in education.] Doctoral dissertation, Teatervetenskapliga institutionen, Stockholm University. Edsbruk: Akademitryck.
- Qvarsell, B. (2003). Barns perspektiv och mänskliga rättigheter: Godhetsmaximering eller kunskapsbildning? [Children's perspective and human rights: Goodness Maximization or knowledge creation?] *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 8(1-2), 101-113.
- Rasmussen, B. (1990). *"Å vaere eller late som om..."*. *Forståelse av dramatisk spill i det tyvende århundre: et dramapedagogisk utredningsarbeid*. ["To be or to pretend". The concept of "Dramatic Playing" in the twentieth century: A drama pedagogical survey.] Doctoral dissertation, University in Trondheim.
- Rasmussen, B. (2008). Beyond imitation and representation: extended comprehension of mimesis in drama education. *Research in Drama Education*:

- The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 13(3), 307-319.
- Rasmussen, B. (2013a). Fra erfaring til refleksiv kunnskap. [From experience to reflexive knowledge.] I Østern, A-L, Stavik-Karlsen, G. & Angelo, E. (Ed.) *Kunstpædagogikk og kunnskapsutvikling* (pp. 261-272). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Rasmussen, B. (2013b). Teater som dannings – I pragmatisk-estetiske rammer. [Theatre as *bildung* – Within pragmatic-aesthetic frames.] In Mjaaland Heggstad, K., Eriksson, S. A. & Rasmussen, B. (Eds.) *Teater som dannings*, pp. 21-36. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Rasmusson, V. (2000). *Drama – konst eller pedagogik? Kampen om ämnet speglad i den nordiska tidskriften Drama 1965-1995*. [Drama – art or pedagogics? The struggle over the subject as reflected in the Nordic journal Drama 1965-1995.] Doctoral dissertation, University of Lund. Drama Boreale: Malmö.
- Rasmusson, V. & Erberth, B. (2016). *Undervisa i pedagogiskt drama*. [Teaching in educational drama.] (4th ed.). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Reynold, E. & Mellor, D. (2013). Deleuze and Guattari in the Nursery: Towards an Ethnographic Multi-Sensory Mapping of Gendered Bodies and Becomings. In Coleman, R. & Ringrose, J. (Eds.) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 23-41). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ringrose, J. & Coleman, R. (2013). Looking and Desiring Machines: A Feminist Deluzian Mapping of Bodies and Affects. In Coleman, R. & Ringrose, J. (Eds.) *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 125-144). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rose, N. (1996). *Inventing our selves: Psychology, Power and Personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1962/1977). *Émile - eller om oppfostran*. [Émile – or On Education.] Göteborg: Stegeland.
- Sæbø, A. B. (2009). *Drama og elevaktiv læring: En studie av hvordan drama svarer på undervisnings- og læringsprosessen didaktiske utfordringer*. [Drama and student active learning: A study of how drama responds to the didactical challenges of the teaching and learning process.] Doctoral dissertation. Trondheim: NTNU.
- Sæbø, A. B. (2011). The Relationship between the Individual and the Collective Learning Process in Drama. In Schonmann, S. (Ed.). *Key Concepts in Theatre/Drama Education* (pp. 23-27). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Sandin, B. (1995). *The Creation of the Modern Child. Educational, Social Change and the Discovery of Normality in Urban Sweden 1850-1910*. Reports on Century of the Child 1995:5. Department of Child Studies: University of Linköping.
- Sawyer, K. (2000). Improvisational Cultures: Collaborative Emergence and Creativity in Improvisation. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 7(3), 180-185.
- Sawyer, K. (2011). *Structure and Improvisation in Creative Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sawyer, K. (2015). Drama. Theatre and Performance Creativity. In Davis, S., Ferholt, B., Grainger Clemens, H., Jansson, S-M. & Majanovic-Shane, A. (Eds.) *Dramatic Interactions in Education: Vygotskian and Sociocultural Approaches to Drama, Education and Research* (pp. 245-260). London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- Schechner, R. (2003). *Performance Theory*. (Revised and expanded ed.). London and New York: Routledge Classics.

- Schön, D. (1991). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. England: Ashgate. (Original work published 1983)
- Semetsky, I. (2006). *Deleuze, Education and Becoming*. Rotterdam/ Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Semetsky, I. (2009). Deleuze as a Philosopher of Education: Affective Knowledge/Effective Learning. *The European Legacy*, 443-456.
- Semetsky, I. (2010). The Folds of Experience, or: Constructing the pedagogy of values.. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(4), 476-488.
- SFS 2010:800. *Skollag*. [Education Act.]
http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/skollag-2010800_sfs-2010-800. (Downloaded: 10 December 2017)
- Skolverket. (1997). *Bildning och kunskap: särtryck ur Läroplanskommitténs betänkande Skola för bildning* (SOU 1992:94). Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Skolverket. (2000). *En fördjupad studie om värdegrunden: Om möten, relationer och samtal som förutsättningar för arbetet med de grundläggande värdena*. [An in-depth of fundamental values: About meetings, relations and conversations as prerequisites for work with the fundamental values.] Dnr 2000: 1613. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Skolverket. (2012). *Likvärdig utbildning i svensk grundskola? En kvantitativ analys av likvärdighet över tid*. [Equivalent education in Swedish compulsory school? A quantitative analysis of equivalence over time.] Rapport 374: 2012.
<http://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=2816>
- Skolverket (2013). *Betydelsen av icke-kognitiva förmågor: Forskning m.m. om individuella faktorer bakom framgång*. [The significance of non-cognitive skills: Research etc. about individual factors behind success.] Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Skolverket. (2016). *PISA 2015: 15-åringars kunskaper i naturvetenskap, läsförståelse och matematik*. [PISA 2015: 15 year olds' knowledge in science, reading comprehension and mathematics.] Rapport 450, 2016. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Slade, P. (1954). *Child Drama*. London: University of London Press.
- Smith, D. W. (2007). Deleuze and the Question of Desire: Towards an immanent theory of ethics. *Parrhesia*, 2, 66-78.
- Somers, J. (2002). Drama making as a research process. *Contemporary Theatre review*, 12(4), 97-111.
- Spolin, V. (1963/1983). *Improvisation for the Theater*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- SOU 1948:27. *1946 års skolkommisssions betänkande med förslag på riktlinjer för det svenska skolväsendets utveckling*.
http://weburn.kb.se/metadata/718/SOU_704718.htm (Downloaded: 4 June 2015.)
- SOU 1992:86. *Ett nytt betygssystem: Slutbetänkande av Betygsberedningen*. Stockholm: Allmänna förl.
- Stanislavskij, K. (1936/1989). *The Actor Prepares*. New York: Routledge.
- Sternudd, M. M. F. (2000). *Dramapedagogik som demokratisk fostran?: Fyra dramapedagogiska perspektiv – dramapedagogik i fyra läroplaner*. Doctoral dissertation. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, Institutionen för pedagogik.
- Sternudd-Groth, M. M. (2017). Reflektion-i-handling, ett förståelsebaserat lärande. [Reflection-in-action, an understanding based learning.] In Aspán, M., Balldin,

- J., Engel, C. & Röing Hellberg, A. (Eds.). *Estetiska uttryck och barns rättigheter i utbildning* (pp. 143-158). Malmö: Gleerups.
- Svalfors, L. (1996). *Från sedlig uppfostran och disciplinering till social status och individuell utveckling*. [From moral fostering and disciplining to social status and individual development.] 1996: 4. Department of Child Studies: University of Linköping.
- Thavenius, J. (2002). *Den goda kulturen och det fria skapandet: Diskurser om "Kultur i skolan"*. [the good culture and the free creation: Discourses about "Culture in school".] Rapporter om utbildning 13/2002. Malmö Högskola.
- The Swedish Schools Inspectorate. (2017). *Arbetsformer och lärarstöd i grundskolan*. [Working forms and teacher support in compulsory school.] <https://www.skolinspektionen.se/globalassets/publikationssok/granskningsrapporter/flygande-inspektioner/2017/rapport-arbetsfo-lararst-grsk-2017-mars.pdf>
- Thirioux, B., Jorland G., Bret, M., Tramus, M-H. & Berthoz, A. (2009). Walking on a line: A motor paradigm using rotation and reflection symmetry to study mental body transformations. *Brain and Cognition*, 70(2), 191-200.
- Thorgersen, K. A. & Alerby, E. (2005). One word to rule them?: The word aesthetics in curricula for the Swedish compulsory school of today. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 14(1), 63-79.)
- Törnquist, E-M. (2000). *Skapande föreställning: Elevers uppfattningar av arbetet i ett musikalprojekt*. [Creative performance: Pupils' perceptions of the work of a musical project.] Thesis for licentiate degree. Malmö: Malmö academy of music.
- Törnquist, E-M. (2006). *Att iscensätta lärande. Lärares reflektioner över det pedagogiska arbetet i en konstnärlig process*. [The staging of learning – teachers' reflections on their pedagogical work in an artistic context.] Doctoral dissertation. Malmö: Malmö academy of music.
- Turner, V. (1974). *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx>
- Vetenskapsrådet. [Swedish Research Council.] (2017). *Good Research practice*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet. <https://www.vr.se/english/analysis-and-assignments/we-analyse-and-evaluate/all-publications/publications/2017-08-31-good-research-practice.html> (Downloaded: 24 June 2018)
- Wahlström, N. (2014). Equity: policy rhetoric or a matter of meaning of knowledge? Towards a Framework for Tracing the 'Efficiency-Equity' Doctrine in Curriculum Documents. *European Educational Research Journal*, 13(6), 731-743.
- Wahlström, N. (2016a). A third wave of European education policy: Transnational and National conceptions of knowledge in Swedish curricula. *European Educational Research Journal*, 15(3), 298–313.
- Wahlström, N. (2016b). *Läroplansteori och didaktik*. [Curriculum theory and didactics.] Falkenberg: Gleerups.
- Wahlström, N. & Sundberg, D. (2015). *En teoribaserad utvärdering av läroplanen Lgr11*. [Theory-based evaluation of the curriculum Lgr11. Rapport 2015:7.] Uppsala: IFAU (Institute for Evaluation of Labor Market and Education Policy).
- Ward, W. (1930). *Creative Dramatics*. London and New York: D. Appleton and Company.

- Way, B. (1967). *Development through Drama*. New York: Humanities Press.
- Wiechel, L. (1983). *Pedagogiskt drama: En väg till social kunskapsbildning*. [Educational drama: A way to social knowledge.] Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.
- Winnicott, D. W. (2005). *Playing and reality*. London and New York: Routledge Classics. (Original work published 1971)
- Wright, P. & Rasmussen, B. (2001). Children and drama: Knowing differently. In Robertson, M. & Gerber, R. (Eds.) *Children's Ways of Knowing: Learning Through Experience* (pp. 218-232). Camberwell: ACER Press.
- Zackari, G. & Modig, F. (2000). *Värdegrundsboken – om samtal för demokrati i skolan*. [The book about fundamental values – about conversations for democracy in school.] Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet.

Appendix 1: Interview guide - pupils

ABOUT DRAMA

What is drama, according to you?

How should you describe drama as subject?

EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPATING IN DRAMA

Which previous experiences do you have of drama?

What is the most difficult, most funny, most boring, best thing about having drama?

Tell about a drama situation that you want to highlight. What make this situation interesting to highlight?

LEARNING IN AND THROUGH DRAMA

What does learning imply, according to you?

Give some examples of how you do to learn new things.

Have you learned something by having drama? Tell about it.

If the pupil answer no: Tell more

If the answer is yes: What was it that made you learn this?

If the answer is yes: Can what you learned in drama be used in other contexts, do you think and if so how?

Can drama be used in other contexts than in school, do you think and if so, how and why?

Have you learned something through drama that you think you could not have learned otherwise and if so, what?

TO ROUND OFF

What would you like to say to others who never tried or know anything about drama?

Is there something more I should have asked?

Do you have some other comments and if so what?

Appendix 2: Interview guide – drama teachers

ABOUT DRAMA

What is drama, according to you?

How should you describe drama as subject?

BACKGROUND

Tell about your background.

Which education do you have in drama?

Do you have another education of significance for your work as a drama teacher?

Do you have other experiences of drama of significance for your work as a drama teacher?

THE PURPOSES WITH DRAMA EDUCATION

How do you perceive drama's role in school connected to its mission to provide knowledge and to foster?

In which different ways do you work with drama in school?

Do you have general purposes and goals for drama education, and if so which?

Do you have specific purposes and goals for drama education in different grades, and if so which?

LEARNING IN AND THROUGH DRAMA

What does learning imply, according to you?

What can the pupils learn by having drama? Tell about it.

What was it that made possible for them to learn this?

Can what is learned through drama be used in other contexts, do you think, and if so how?

Do you think something can be learned through drama that not can be learned otherwise and if so, what?

ORGANIZATIONAL CONDITIONS FOR DRAMA

Which are the organizational conditions for drama education in this school?

Which possibilities and obstacles do these organizational conditions imply for drama education? For you as a drama teacher? For the pupils?

Have the conditions for drama teaching changed over time, and if so how?

If so, how has it affected your work as a drama teacher?

If you were to wish freely, what would drama's role be within school education? Tell about it.

TO ROUND OFF

Is there something more I should have asked?

Do you have some other comments and if so what?